

THE *BREVIARIUM* OF FESTUS

*A Critical Edition with
Historical Commentary*

by
J. W. EADIE

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
THE ATHLONE PRESS

1967

Published by
THE ATHLONE PRESS
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
at 2 Gower Street, London WC1

Distributed by Constable & Co Ltd
12 Orange Street, London WC2

Canada
Oxford University Press
Toronto
U.S.A.
Oxford University Press, Inc
New York

© J. W Eadie, 1967

Printed in Great Britain by
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS LTD
London and Beccles

PREFACE

OUR knowledge and evaluation of Latin historiography can never be complete, for our corpus represents only a fraction of the historical literature produced in antiquity. The limits of our assessment have been predetermined by the accident of survival – by the principles of selection which the scribes employed and by the cumulative effect of natural cataclysm and political disorder. That any historical work should have defied this destructive combination is truly remarkable. To some modern scholars, of course, many of the survivors seem less worthy than the victims, whose value is enhanced by the tantalizing, but not necessarily accurate, testimonia in extant histories. Yet, while the preservation of some histories may be entirely fortuitous, most have been transmitted because they possess certain qualities which scribes and scholars in the past have considered attractive or useful. A few can qualify as ‘greats’ and have timeless appeal; the remainder exist because they were in some way useful or unusual.

The *Breviarium* of Festus belongs to the second category of survivors. In the past it doubtless was considered a useful, concise primer of Roman history; it benefited from the ‘official’ approval of a Roman Emperor (Valens); and it contains some information which is not recorded elsewhere (e.g. the provincial lists, the account of Roman-Persian conflicts from Diocletian to Julian). To modern historians the *Breviarium* is important both as a primary source *inter alia* for the history of the fourth century A.D. and as a late representative of the Livian tradition in Roman historiography. Yet, a reliable text of the *Breviarium* has not been available for some time; the editions of W. Foerster (1874) and C. Wagener (1886) have long been out of print. To fill this lacuna I have undertaken a new edition of the *Breviarium*, based on an examination of all extant MSS, and, in addition, have provided for the first time a complete *Quellenforschung* and an historical commentary on the text.

In writing this book, which represents a thorough revision of a thesis approved by the University of London for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy, I was greatly helped by the kindness and erudition of friends and scholars. To Mr E. G. Handley, Mr A. H. McDonald, Professor Sir Roger Mynors, Professor H. H. Scullard and Professor Otto Skutsch, I should like to express my sincere appreciation for advice and assistance on historical and textual matters; I have been saved by their care from a number of egregious errors. Above all, I should like to thank my mentor, Professor A. D. Momigliano, whose kindness has made this book possible and whose vast learning has contributed much to its improvement. For the errors which remain I alone am responsible. Finally, I should like to acknowledge the generous assistance of the Central Research Committee of the University of London from whom I received a grant for the purchase of microfilm.

J. W. E.

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	xi
AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF COMPOSITION	i
THE BREVIARIUM AS AN HISTORICAL GENRE	10
MANUSCRIPTS; EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS; TEXTUAL PROBLEMS	21
A. Manuscripts, 21	
B. Editions and Translations, 32	
C. Textual Problems, 35	
THE BREVIARIUM	43
THE SOURCES OF THE BREVIARIUM	70
HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE TEXT	99
APPENDIX: THE PROVINCIAL LISTS	154
BIBLIOGRAPHY	173
INDEXES	179
Verba, 179	
General Index, 180	
Peoples and Places, 186	
Ancient Authors and Passages, 190	
Index of Manuscripts, 194	

ABBREVIATIONS

AC	<i>L'Antiquité classique</i>
AFLC	<i>Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e di Filosofia Università di Cagliari</i>
AJPh	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
ALL	<i>Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie</i>
AO	<i>Archiv Orientalni</i>
BCAR	<i>Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma</i>
ByzZ	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
CIL	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
Class Journ	<i>Classical Journal</i>
Cod Iust	<i>Codex Iustinianus</i>
CPh	<i>Classical Philology</i>
CREBM	<i>H. Mattingly, Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum</i>
CTh	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i>
Degrassi	<i>A. Degrassi, Fasti Consulares et Triumphales, in Inscriptiones Italiae XIII, 1</i>
FGrH	<i>F. Jacoby, Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i>
FHG	<i>C. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i>
HSCPh	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>
IGR	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes</i>
ILS	<i>H. Dessau, Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JÖAL	<i>Jahreshefte des Oesterreichischen Archäologischen Insti- tuts in Wien</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
Magie, RRAM	<i>D. Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor</i>
Mansi, Conc.	<i>J. D. Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio</i>
Migne, PL	<i>J. P. Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina</i>
Not. Dign.	<i>O. Seeck (ed.), Notitia Dignitatum</i>
OGI	<i>W. Dittenberger, Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae</i>
Phil. Wochenschr.	<i>Philologische Wochenschrift</i>
RA	<i>Revue Archéologique</i>

<i>RE</i>	Pauly, Wissowa, Kroll, <i>Real-Encyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des études anciennes</i>
<i>RevPhil</i>	<i>Revue de Philologie</i>
<i>RhM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum</i>
<i>RIC</i>	Mattingly-Sydenham, <i>Roman Imperial Coinage</i>
<i>RivFC</i>	<i>Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione Classica</i>
<i>RLAC</i>	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>SBAW</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München</i>
Seeck, <i>Regesten</i>	O. Seeck, <i>Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste</i>
<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>
<i>TAPhA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>UMichStud</i>	<i>University of Michigan Studies: Humanistic Series</i>
<i>YCS</i>	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i>

AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF COMPOSITION

SINCE the appearance of the *editio princeps* of the *Breviarium* in 1468, a great many scholars have attempted to identify its author, the Emperor to whom it was dedicated, and its date of composition. None, however, has reached irrefutable conclusions, nor has all the evidence been collected and evaluated satisfactorily in one paper.¹ Therefore, on these questions it may be profitable to reassess the evidence already adduced, together with the results of recent investigations.

Fortunately, it is possible to determine by internal criticism in what year the *Breviarium* was written. The *terminus ante quem*, as Mommsen² observed, is provided by the omission of Valentia from the list of British provinces in ch. VI: in Brittania Maxima Caesariensis, Flauia Caesariensis, Brittania prima, Brittania secunda. According to Ammianus (28. 3. 7), in 369 Theodosius the Elder – whom Valentinian had despatched to Britain two years earlier – recuperatamque provinciam, quae in dicionem concesserat hostium, ita reddiderat statui pristino, ut eodem referente et rectorem haberet legitimum, et Valentia deinde vocaretur arbitrio principis, velut *ovantis*.³ So pleased was Valentinian with the successful conclusion of the British campaign that he summoned Theodosius to the court and generously rewarded the commander: Theodosius venit ad conmilitem principis, cumque gaudio susceptus et laudibus, in locum Jovini ut lenti successit, qui equorum copias tuebatur. Since we know that Theodosius had been confirmed as *magister equitum*

¹ Richard Jacobi (*De Festi Breviarii fontibus* [Bonn, 1874]) contributed a valuable synthesis of the literary evidence, but did not consider relevant epigraphic and administrative material.

² 'Verzeichniss der römischen Provinzen aufgesetzt um 297,' *Ges. Schr.* v (1908), 587.

³ The text of Ammianus is corrupt at this point – a lacuna of several letters follows *ovantis* in the best manuscripts. C. U. Clark's text (Berlin, 1910), which I have followed, reads *ut ovantis*. 8 . . . tudio nuntio inest.

by 28 May 370 (*CTh* 3. 14. 1)¹, we may infer that he arrived at court after the campaigning season of 369 – the season in which he reclaimed Valentia – and before the end of May 370. News of his victory in Britain, therefore, must have been received in the Imperial capitals no later than the summer of 370. If the *Breviarium* had been written after the recovery of Valentia was announced, this new acquisition certainly would have been listed among the provinces of Britain; since it does not appear, we may conclude that the *Breviarium* was completed before the summer of 370.

In addition, we know that the *Breviarium* was written after 363, for the narrative ends with a report of Jovian's humiliating surrender of Nisibis to the Persians. An even more precise *terminus post quem* can be deduced from the concluding address to the Emperor in ch. XXX: *Maneat . . . felicitas, ut ad hanc ingentem de Gothis etiam Babyloniae tibi palma pacis accedat.*² Since the *Breviarium* was completed between 363 and 370, the 'ingentem de Gothis' may be dated to that six-year period – i.e. while Valentinian and Valens were co-Emperors. The 'princeps inuicte' of ch. XXX must be Valens, for the Eastern Emperor would have directed any campaign against the Goths, who inhabited the territory north of the Hister (lower Danube) River.³ Ammianus (27. 5) reports that for three years Valens' troops engaged the Goths who were making inroads into Thrace; finally, in 369 a peace was concluded which secured the Thracian frontier until around 375. It is possible to recognize

¹ This rescript was issued 'V Kal. Iun. [28 May] Valent(iniano) et Valente AA. Conss.' – i.e. in 365, 368, 370 or 373. We may eliminate 365, for in that year Jovinus was still *magister equitum* (*CTh* 8. 1. 10; 7. 1. 7). Similarly, the year 373 can be rejected, since Theodosius then would have replaced Severus, not Jovinus (*CTh* 7. 1. 11). W. Ensslin ('Zum Heermeisteramt des spätrömischen Reiches,' *Klio* 23 [1930], 313) dated the rescript to 368, but this conflicts with Ammianus' chronology – i.e. Theodosius was received at court and promoted *after* his successful campaign of 369 in Britain. The rescript, therefore, must have been issued in 370.

² Evidence that the *Breviarium* was dedicated to an Emperor is found in the various official forms of address: 'clementia tua' and 'gloriosissime princeps' (ch. I), 'perennitatis uestrae' (ch. II), 'inclyte princeps' (ch. XV), and 'princeps inuicte' (ch. XXX). On these designations see R. Gonçalves, *Humanitas* 11 (1948–9), 131 ff; M. Hammond, *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 25 (1957), 51.

³ Any doubt that the Eastern Emperor was the intended recipient of the *Breviarium* is dispelled by ch. X: *Nunc Eoas partes totumque Orientem ac positas sub uicino sole prouincias, qui auctores sceptris tuis parauerint, explicabo. . .*

in 'ingentem de Gothis' a reference to the treaty signed by Valens and Athanarich, the Gothic chieftain, in 369. Thus, we may conclude that the *Breviarium* was published in final form some time after the end of the Gothic campaign – although this does not preclude the completion of chs. I–XXIX before the treaty with Athanarich was signed – and before the news of the recovery of Valentia had been circulated throughout the Empire.

That the *Breviarium* was dedicated to Valens seems proved by internal evidence (chs. X, XXX). Yet, the oldest manuscripts of the *Breviarium* offer conflicting testimony concerning this dedication. Escorial R. II. 18, our oldest manuscript, has this explicit: *Explicitum Breviarium Rufi Festi vic Augusti Valenti scriptum feliciter*. On the other hand, five manuscripts (Vienna 89, Vienna 323, Brussels 4659, Paris nouv. acq. Lat. 310, Paris 6114) have a unique dedication to Valentinian: *pio perpetuo Valentiniano domino imperatori semper Ruffus Festus v. c.*¹ As I shall demonstrate below (p. 22 f.), these five MSS represent a single tradition – they are traceable independently to a common archetype, which was produced before the end of the ninth century (the paleographical date of Vienna 89). This dedication, therefore, doubtless appeared in the archetype. Moreover, the words *pio perpetuo* and *domino*, representative of the obsequious court language of the late Empire, suggest that the archetype reproduced an authentic fourth-century dedication to Valentinian. If the reading Valentinian did not result from an improper expansion of an abbreviation for Valens (e.g. Val.) – the possibility of such a scribal error cannot be excluded – then it is possible that the divergent MS traditions reflect a dual dedication in the fourth century. Indeed, the apparent conflict between the undeniable internal evidence that Valens was the Emperor for whom the *Breviarium* was written and the manuscript evidence of a dedication to Valentinian can be resolved. The author first may have presented a copy of the *Breviarium* to Valens and later, having suitably revised the dedication, a second copy to Valentinian.

¹ The rest of the early manuscripts – Bamberg E. III. 22, Paris 6113a, Vienna 451, Paris 5822 – omit the dedication. These manuscripts are described below, pp. 23 ff.

Unfortunately, this hypothesis cannot be proved, but it must be considered a possible explanation of the divergent traditions.

In the oldest manuscripts the author of the *Breviarium* is given the following names: Festus (Gotha 101, Bamberg E. III. 22, Paris 6113a), Rufus or Ruffus Festus (Escorial R. II. 18, Vienna 89, Vienna 323, Paris 6114, Paris nouv. acq. Lat. 310), and Ruffus Sextus (Brussels 4659). Obviously, these traditions are not irreconcilable: with the exception of Brussels 4659 – Sextus is probably a misreading of Festus in the minuscule exemplar – all the manuscripts attest the nomen Festus. The praenomen, on the other hand, may or may not be Rufus or Ruffus. It will be quite accurate, therefore, simply to call our author Festus.

Officials named Festus were not uncommon in the late Empire; they appear in inscriptions, in the correspondence of Emperors, and in literary sources. A Festus achieved official recognition as *praeses Sardiniae* in 319 (*CTh* 9. 40. 3); in the fifth century, a Festus was chosen as consul on two occasions – in 439 and 472.¹ During the last half of the fourth century, several Festi were consulars and at least three secured proconsular posts. Of the latter the most familiar is the Festus described by Ammianus, Eunapius and Libanius.

Ammianus (29. 2. 22) provides the most extensive account of his career: Festus² quidam Tridentinus ultimi sanguinis et ignoti . . . ad orientem transgressus est, ibique administrata Syria magisterioque memoriae peracto . . . unde regere Asiam proconsulari potestate exorsus. . . .³ As *proconsul Asiae* this Festus initiated a reign of terror in emulation of Maximinus' activities at Rome. The victims of his purge seem to have been persons suspected of practising magic: the philosopher Coeranius, an old woman who cured fevers 'leni carmine', a citizen who cast horoscopes, and a young man who made a superstitious sign to cure his stomach ailment. An independent assessment of this persecution is provided by Eunapius, who bitterly denounced Festus for his execution of the well-known theurgist Maximus and charged that this was all part of a plot to ex-

¹ Seeck, *Regesten*, 367–9, 416–19.

² The variant 'Festinus' is found in the edition of Gelenius (1533), but Clark rightly considers this an incorrect emendation.

³ Cp. Zosimus 4. 15. 2–3 and Suidas s.v. φῆστος.

terminate the ancient religion and its adherents: 'it was for their worship of the gods that he punished all his victims with death'.¹ Although Eunapius admits that Festus had received instructions from Valens, it is not certain whether Maximus and the others (πολλοὺς) were executed at Valens' orders or summarily by Festus. Eunapius evidently thought both Emperor and proconsul culpable; he rejoiced equally in the defeat of Valens at Adrianople (9 April 378) and in the deposition shortly thereafter of Festus from the office of *proconsul Asiae* – both of which he attributed to divine justice. Moreover, he clearly enjoyed recounting that Festus, troubled by a portent-laden dream, collapsed and died on the third day before the kalends of January in 379 (30 December 379). In view of his activities as pagan apologist, the reliability of Eunapius' charge that the persecution was directed against pagans is questionable. All the more, since the detailed account of Ammianus – a pagan writing some twenty-five years later – indicates that persons practising magic headed the list for extermination. Nonetheless, stripped of indignation and suspect accusations, Eunapius' account does confirm Festus' tenure as proconsul of Asia (which terminated between 9 April 378 and 30 December 379) and uniquely supplies the precise date of his death (30 December 379).

Further proof that Festus was proconsul of Asia during the 370's is provided by a rescript from Valens, Valentinian and Gratian, which was issued sometime after 26 April 372 and before 17 November 375.² This evidence reinforces Eunapius' statement (*loc. cit.*) that Festus, not long after his arrival in Asia, ordered the execution of Maximus at Ephesus. Since we know that Maximus was killed in late 371 or early 372 (Amm. Marc. 29. 1), it seems probable that Festus arrived in his province not later than the beginning of 372. Thus we may conclude that Festus served as proconsul of Asia from 372 until sometime after 9 April 378.

Other elements of Ammianus' account similarly are corroborated by independent testimony. That a Festus was *consularis*

¹ *Vitae Sophistarum* (ed. Giangrande) 7. 6. 6–13.

² A. Schulten, 'Zwei Erlasse des Kaisers Valens über die Provinz Asia,' *JÖAI* 9 (1906), 61 ff.

Syriae is substantiated by Libanius (*Or.* I. 156) and by a rescript from Valens and Valentinian (*CTh* 8. 4. 11 = *Cod. Iust.* 11. 57. 3) 'Festo consulari Syriae'. From this dated rescript – 'dat. VI non. Oct. Valentiniano et Valente AA. Conss.' – we know that Festus was *consularis Syriae* on 2 October 365.¹ For our purposes, however, the third official post credited to Festus by Ammianus – i.e. *magister memoriae* – is the most important, for a connection between this 'historical' Festus and the author of the *Breviarium* is established by the incipit (repeated in the explicit) found in Bamberg E. III. 22: Incipit Breviarium Festi \overline{VC} Magistri Memoriae. It seems unlikely that the official title *magister memoriae*, which does not appear in any other MS, could have been inserted by a scribe. To augment the incipit in this manner the scribe must have consulted Ammianus' list of offices held by Festus and must have concluded that Ammianus' Festus and the author of the *Breviarium* were the same person. Since Ammianus does not include in his account any reference to Festus' literary activities, I doubt that the ninth century scribe could have identified Ammianus' Festus as the author of the *Breviarium*. In short, the Bamberg manuscript seems to reproduce intact the incipit of the archetype or hyparchetype of an authoritative manuscript tradition.

Since the official title appears in the incipit, we may infer that the author was *magister memoriae* when the *Breviarium* was published (369/70). Certain remarks in the *Breviarium* indicate that the author was familiar with proposed military ventures and had been commissioned by the Emperor to write the *Breviarium*: e.g. Scio nunc, inclyte princeps, quo tua pergat intentio (ch. XV) and Breuem fieri clementia tua praecepit (ch. I). Could not the *Breviarium* be the work of the *magister memoriae*, who adnotationes omnes dictat et emittit, et precibus respondet?² With regard to the 'historical' Festus, Ammianus states that he first was *consularis Syriae* (c. 365), then *magister memoriae*, and finally *proconsul Asiae* (from 372 until after 9 April 378); therefore, he was *magister memoriae* between 365 and 372. That two Festi occupied the same position, under the same Emperor, within

¹ See A. F. Norman *ByzZ* 51 (1958), 73 ff.

² This description of the duties of the *magister memoriae* is found in *Not. Dign., Orientis* (ed. Seeck, p. 44).

a few years of one another seems rather improbable; indeed, the evidence suggests that the Festus depicted by Ammianus is the author of the *Breviarium*.

Alternative identifications, however, are possible. A Latin inscription (*CIL* VI 537 = *ILS* I 2944) records the verse of R. Festus to the goddess Nortia and the epigram of Placidus to his father:

R. Festus ·VC· de se ad deam Nortiam
 Festus Musoni suboles prolesque Avieni
 unde tui latices traxerunt Caesia nomen
 Nortia te veneror lari cretus Vulsiniensi
 Romam habitans gemino proconsulis auctus honore
 carmina multa serens, vitam insons, integer aevum
 coniugio laetus Placidae numeroque frequenti
 natorum exultans. Vivax sit spiritus ollis!
 Cetera composita fatorum cuncta trahentur.
 Sancto patri filius Placidus.
 Inis in optatas sedes: nam Juppiter aetheram
 pandit, Feste, tibi, candidus ut venias.
 Iamque venis, tendit dextras chorus inde deorum.

Mommsen identified this Festus as either the poet, Rufius Festus Avienus, or his son. Garroni (following Wernsdorf)¹ compared the epigram of Placidus with the opening lines of Avienus' translation of Aratus' *Phainomena*:

Carminis incentor mihi Juppiter! auspice terras
 linquo Jove et celsam reserat dux Juppiter aetheram;
 imus in astra Jovis monitu, Jovis omine caelum
 et Jovia imperio mortalibus aethera pando,

and concluded that Placidus adapted these lines as a tribute to his father, who was, he suggests, Avienus. This hypothesis seems entirely credible.

The two proconsular positions of R. Festus (Avienus) – gemino proconsulis auctus honore – must have been in the provinces of Achaia, Africa, or Asia, for only they were governed by proconsuls throughout the fourth century. Evidence that

¹ A. Garroni, *BCAR* 43 (1915), 125–6; J. C. Wernsdorf, *Poetae Latini minores* v (Paris, 1825), 1 ff.

Avienus served as *proconsul Achaiae* may be provided by an inscription (IG 635) concerning *TON ΛΑΜΠΙΠΟΤΑΤΟΝ ΑΝΘΥΠ-ΑΤΟΝ/ΤΗC ΕΛΛΑΔΟC ΠΟΥΦΙΟΝ ΦΗCΤΟΝ*. Garroni (following Monceaux)¹ identified this Rufios Festos as R. Festus Avienus and, in support, quoted two lines from the *Descriptio orbis terrae* (603 ff.) in which Avienus speaks knowingly of Greece:

Illic saepe deum conspeximus adridentem;
inter turicremas hic Phoebum vidimus aras.

From this it is evident that Avienus travelled in Greece, but Garroni's statement that 'of the two proconsulates (of Avienus) one was without doubt that of Achaia' is too positive; 'probably' would have been a fairer judgment.

Another possible proconsular post for Avienus is suggested by the rescript, dated 9 June 367, from Valens and Valentinian 'ad Festum p(ro) c(onsulem) Afric(ae)' (*CTh* 9. 19. 3). This Festus, however, Monceaux has identified as Julius Festus Hymetius, whose tenure in 366/7 is certified by three inscriptions (*CIL* VIII 10609, VIII 5336, VI 1736) and a rescript (*CTh* 11. 30. 20). Nonetheless, Monceaux (followed by Garroni) was convinced that Avienus' second proconsular post was in Africa. As proof he cited several lines from the *Descriptio orbis* (330 ff.), in which Avienus describes in some detail the Negroes of the Sudan, and a minor poem (*Carmina minora* 1, 2-5) in which the poet betrays a taste for Carthaginian pomegranates. Monceaux concluded: 'Nous ne connaissons pas encore les gouverneurs d'Afrique de 384, 387, 388, 391, 392 ni ceux de 355, 356, 358, 362. A notre avis, c'est plutôt entre les années 355 et 362 que le poète pourra redevenir proconsul à Carthage'.² This patently *ex silentio* argument is scarcely convincing, but it must be admitted that Avienus was familiar with Africa and may have served there as proconsul.

Finally, we have to determine whether there is any connection between Avienus and the Festus, proconsul of Asia, described by Ammianus. Garroni argues that Avienus cannot have been proconsul of Asia, for he, in *Descriptio orbis* 896, 'does not

¹ Garroni, p. 127; P. Monceaux, 'Note sur un proconsul d'Afrique: le poète Avienus', *RA* 9 (1887), 191-2.

² Monceaux, pp. 195-7.

describe it (Asia) from personal knowledge'.¹ An even more decisive objection is that the family background of the two men apparently is incompatible. Unless Ammianus effected a deliberate lapse of memory, we can eliminate any connection between his Festus 'ultimi sanguinis et ignoti' and R. Festus Avienus 'Musoni suboles prolesque Avieni'. In short, R. Festus Avienus cannot be Festus, *proconsul Asiae*.

I cannot discover any evidence which suggests that R. Festus Avienus – probably proconsul of Achaia, possibly proconsul of Africa – was the author of the *Breviarium*. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine the author of the *Breviarium* 'carmina multa serens' – his style rather lacks the poet's touch. On the other hand, as I have pointed out, Festus – *consularis Syriae* around 365, *magister memoriae* under Valens, *proconsul Asiae* during the 370's – is indissolubly connected with the author of the *Breviarium* through the incipit of Bamberg E. III. 22. Thus, we may conclude that the Festus reported by Ammianus *et al.* was Festus, author of the *Breviarium*.²

¹ Garroni, p. 127.

² Evidence that Festus was a pagan seems conclusive. That he never alludes to Christianity in his history is a certain indication – especially since the Emperor to whom he addressed his work, Valens, was a Christian. In the lively exchange between pagan and Christian polemicists during the fourth century, Christian writers rarely missed an opportunity to excoriate their adversaries or to proclaim the merits of Christianity. Another indication of Festus' pagan sympathies is his fair and relatively lengthy treatment of Julian, the archpagan. Finally, it is unlikely that a Christian would have written 'Maneat modo concessa dei nutu et ab amico, cui credis et creditus es, numine indulta felicitas' (ch. XXX). At first glance the phrases *concessa dei nutu* and *ab amico . . . numine indulta* seem redundant. I believe, however, that *deus* refers to the deity acknowledged by Festus (i.e. the pagan god), while *numen* denotes the God worshipped by Valens (i.e. the Christian God). Festus petitions both on behalf of the Emperor.

THE *BREVIARIUM* AS AN HISTORICAL GENRE

E. MALCOVATI,¹ in her paper on the *breviaria*, provides a welcome antithesis to those scholars who consider the fourth century just another depressing phase in the decline of Latin letters. In contrast to the cultural inanition of the preceding century, she assembles convincing evidence of a revival beginning with the accession of Constantine. Although private families such as the Nicomachi and the Symmachi contributed, the principal stimulus of this 'first renaissance' was the increased participation of the Emperors in cultural affairs. The foundation by Constantine of museums and libraries in Constantinople, the encouragement of liberal studies among officials by Constantius and Julian (*CTh* 14. 1. 1), an ordinance of Valentinian, Valens and Gratian *de studiis liberalibus urbis Romae et Constantinopolitanae* (*CTh* 14. 9. 1), the ordinances of Constans II (in 358) and Valens (in 372) concerning the acquisition and copying of manuscripts of ancient authors (Themistius *Or.* 4. 59 and *CTh* 14. 9. 2) – all these indicate Imperial interest in the rehabilitation of cultural tradition. Correspondingly, this renewed interest in the cultural heritage of antiquity stimulated the production of histories of Roman affairs. The quality of these histories, however, frequently reflects more the languid habits of the third century than the rebirth of a classical *Weltanschauung*. Ammianus Marcellinus, who essayed a return to the Tacitean model, illustrates the literary appetite of the contemporary reading public (i.e. late fourth century) by his preface to book XV of his history, in which he issued a sharp retort to past and potential 'obtretores' who might find his work prolix: *Tunc enim laudanda est brevitās, cum moras rumpens intempestivas, nihil subtrahit cognitioni gestorum*. Ammianus' work belonged to the eloquent age of Latin historiography –

¹ E. Malcovati, 'I Breviari del IV secolo', *AFLC* XXI (1942), 5–11.

epitomes, chronica, and breviararia already had displaced the more discursive historical efforts.

It is difficult to define precisely an epitome, chronicon, or breviarium, for ancient authors do not provide a description of their characteristics. Moreover, we cannot determine in every instance the antiquity of a title; titles often were supplied by medieval scribes for purposes of reference and/or cataloguing. The title epitome, chronicon, or breviarium, therefore, should be applied to a work only when (1) the title is authenticated by an ancient reference, or (2) the best manuscripts provide a title.

On the basis of the many epitomes which have survived, we can state reliably that an epitome is simply an abridgment of a specific work, sometimes conflated with other sources (e.g. Florus). With comparable certainty a chronicon may be defined as a short, chronological history, usually compiled from two or more literary sources supplemented by the author's memory, commencing at a fixed historical event (e.g. the creation of man) and brought down approximately to the author's own time. Similar to the chronicon, but different in emphasis, is the breviarium – a brief Roman history, compiled from two or more sources, commencing with the founding of Rome and brought down to the author's own time.¹

Of these three historical forms the epitome is the oldest, having achieved some popularity in the pre-Christian, Greek-speaking world. Although the identity and date of the first Latin epitome is not certain, most scholars consider the lost *Epitome Liviana* (whose scope and design are known from later testimonia), possibly written in the reign of Tiberius, one of the early adaptations of the Greek form.² By the end of the third

¹ Cf. E. Wölfflin, 'Epitome', *ALL* xii (1902), 342: 'Das Wort (sc. breviarium) nicht notwendig als eine gekürzte Fassung eines ausführlicheren Originalen, sondern ebenso gut eine "Kurze Darstellung" bezeichnen kann.' In all his works on the subject, Wölfflin insists that breviarum can also denote epitome. I can discover no ancient evidence which supports this equivalence. This error is repeated by M. Galdi, *L'epitome nella letteratura Latina* (Naples, 1922), 229. The recent article 'Epitome' in *RLAC* 38 (1961), 447 ff., quotes approvingly the distinction made by Schanz-Hosius: 'Das Breviarium gibt eine eigene kurz gefasste Übersicht über den historischen Stoff, die Epitome den Auszug aus einem fremden Werk.' The convenient list and discussion of historical epitomes in this article are especially valuable.

² On the date of the *Epitome Liviana* see H. A. Sanders, 'The Lost Epitome of Livy', *Mich. Stud.* 1 (1904), 255–60.

century, the epitome had become an acceptable and very popular Latin historical genre. Indeed, it may be said that the epitome established the market for short histories in late antiquity. Contemporary with the increased popularity of the epitome was the reintroduction of the Greek chronicon, altered by Sextus Julius Africanus and Hippolytus to fit the requirements of the burgeoning Christian reading public. In the early fourth century, Eusebius' *Chronicon* extended these models and established the permanent form for Christian chronica. During the fourth century Latin imitations and translations of these Greek chronica – e.g. *Liber Generationis* and Jerome's *Chronicon* – appeared and, in turn, gave rise to later Latin continuations.¹

According to Suetonius (*De Grammaticis* 10), Lucius Ateius Praetextatus Philologus compiled for Sallust what may have been the first breviarium: (Ateius) coluit postea familiarissime C. Sallustium et eo defuncto Asinium Pollionem, quos historiam componere aggressos, alterum breviario rerum omnium Romanarum, ex quibus quas vellet eligeret, instruxit, alterum praeceptis de ratione scribendi. Wölfflin, however, rightly pointed out that Suetonius, rather than Ateius, may have given the title *breviarium* to the work.² In this connection the younger Seneca, in a letter (39, 1) to Lucilius, provides some evidence that the word breviarium was post-Augustan: Commentarios, quos desideras, diligenter ordinatos et in angustum coactos ego vero componam. Sed vide, ne plus profutura sit ratio ordinaria quam haec, quae nunc vulgo breviarium dicitur, olim cum latine loqueremur, summarium vocabatur. It is possible, of course, that the breviarium to which Seneca refers may be something other than a history.³ This much is certain: that Ateius' history, written in the first century B.C., had acquired the title 'breviarium rerum omnium Romanarum' at least as

¹ On the relationship between the Latin adaptations and their Greek originals see T. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora* 1 (1892), 86.

² E. Wölfflin, *op. cit.*, 342.

³ For example, breviarium also may denote an account of personal or group activities (Pliny, *HN* 7. 26 (97); Augustine *ep.* 185. 6; Cassianus, *Inst.* 4. 43), an administrative list (Suetonius, *Aug.* 101), or simply a daily agenda (Suetonius, *Vesp.* 21). In all these usages, of course, the common connotation is brevity. Cf. the synonyms for breviarium: breviculus – a short account (Augustine, *Retract.* II. LXV [65]), a military list (Rufinus, *Apol. adv. Hier.* 2. 36); breviatio – a short account (Augustine, *ep.* 139. 3).

early as the opening years of the second century A.D. (when Suetonius wrote *De Grammaticis*). Thus, we may conclude that the title *breviarium* had been given to at least one historical work by the reign of Hadrian. However, since Ateius' history has been lost and Suetonius' reference to it is so brief, we cannot determine whether his *breviarium* differed from the *breviaria* of the fourth century. Similarly obscure is the evolution of the *breviarium* from Ateius to Eutropius; indeed, we have no evidence that any *breviarium* was published in the interim.

The title *Breviarium* generally is attached to the histories of Eutropius and Festus on the authority of pre-thirteenth-century manuscripts. Mommsen¹ assigned to Eutropius' history the title *Breviarium ab urbe condita* on the authority of a single codex, Gothanus 101 (saec. IX): inscription – Incipit Breviarium Eutropi; subscription to books I and IX – Breviarium ab urbe condita liber [I, IX] explicit.² With this should be compared the incipit and subscription of Vaticanus 1860: Eutropi liber primus rerum gestarum; Ab urbe condita explicit liber X. The only alternative titles are provided by codex Petropolitanus (saec. IX) – Eutropi *VI* historiarum Romanorum liber primus incipit – and Vaticanus Palatinus 927 (anno 1223) – Epythoma ex libris Eutropi Victorini historici de consulibus. Neither of the last two readings has great authority, since both MSS contain only excerpts from Eutropius' history. Although the antiquity of the titles in Gothanus 101 and Vaticanus 1860 cannot be established, the title *Breviarium ab urbe condita* does seem to describe accurately the Livian character of Eutropius' work.

Of the eleven oldest manuscripts of Festus' history, only nine have an inscription and/or subscription which assign a title:³

Breviarium Festi Rerum Gestarum Populi Romani (Vienna 89, Paris 6114, Vienna 323, Brussels 4659)

Breviarium Festi De Breviario Rerum Gestarum Populi Romani (Escorial R. II. 18, Paris 6113a, Bamberg E. III. 22)

¹ 'Breviarium Eutropius ab urbe condita', *Hermes* 1 (1866), 468.

² Mommsen, *idem*: 'Eutropius muss seine Arbeit nicht als Auszug schlechtweg bezeichnet haben, sondern als Auszug aus Livius, sei es nun, dass er dies indirekt tat, indem er sein Werk "Auszug aus den Büchern *ab urbe condita*" betitelte, oder dass der volle Titel seines Abrisses gelautes hat *Breviarium T. Livii ab urbe condita*.'

³ Vienna 451 and Paris 5822 have neither inscription nor subscription.

De Breviario Rerum Gestarum Populi Romani (Gotha 101)
 Liber Rufini <sic> De Gestis Romanorum (Paris nouv. acq.
 lat. 310)

The independent value of the last two possibilities is slight: Gotha 101 seems to preserve a truncated form of the title suggested by the Escorial, Paris and Bamberg manuscripts; Paris nouv. acq. lat. 310 reproduces an obviously faulty title, which may result from the absence of a title in the exemplar. A choice between the two other possibilities is more difficult. If *De Breviario* denotes the source from which Festus borrowed – i.e. *Breviarium* from a *Breviarium rerum gestarum populi Romani* – then it may reflect Festus' remark in ch. I: Accipe ergo, quod breuiter dictis breuius computetur.¹ The validity of this title, however, is placed in doubt by the results of source criticism; Festus, as I shall demonstrate, obtained his information from at least two sources. Yet, the age and authority of the manuscripts which contain this title are sufficient to preclude hasty dismissal. The alternative title – which omits *De Breviario* – presents no difficulty, but is supported by somewhat less accurate manuscripts. The similarity between the two traditions suggests that a title was introduced early in the manuscript transmission. The divergence may be explained in one of two ways: either the original title included *De Breviario*, which subsequently dropped out through scribal error, or *De Breviario* was inserted in the original title by a corrector, who may have emended the text on the basis of Festus' remark in ch. I. As the conflict between the two traditions cannot be resolved satisfactorily, it seems preferable to accept the title common to both groups: *Breviarium Festi*.

In addition to the usual reasons which lead men to publish histories, Festus and Eutropius were motivated by Imperial commissions – or so we may infer from their dedications (Eutropius: Ex voluntate mansuetudinis tuae; Festus: Breuem fieri clementia tua praecepit). The ostensible purpose of each

¹ E. Wölfflin, 'Das Breviarium des Festus', *ALL* XIII (1904), 71, argues that *De Breviario rerum gestarum populi Romani* 'gehören also zum Titel, und der Verfasser versprach in demselben nur einen Abriss aus einem Abrisse der römischen Geschichte zu geben; welche Kapitel er auf Grund der Bestellung herausgriff, sagt er uns in Kap. 4 und 15.'

breviarium was to instruct and enlighten the Emperor: Eutropius – *Res Romanas ex voluntate mansuetudinis tuae . . . brevi narratione collegi . . . ut tranquillitatis tuae possit mens divina laetari prius se inlustrum virorum facta in administrando imperio secutam, quam cognosceret lectione*; Festus – *Accipe [this Breviarium] . . . ut annos et aetatem rei publicae ac praeteriti facta temporis non tam legere tibi, gloriosissime princeps, quam numerare uidearis*.¹ This common purpose has led some scholars (e.g. W. Foerster) to doubt that both breviaria were dedicated to the same Emperor, Valens.² They argue that Valens would not have commissioned two breviaria when one provided all the information which he required. To invalidate the considerable evidence that both histories were dedicated to Valens, however, it must be established that Eutropius and Festus develop the same material. That there are substantive differences between the two breviaria may be demonstrated by comparing the amount of space allotted to each of the three epochs of Roman history:

Regal period:	Eutropius – I, 1–8 Festus ——— ch. II
Republic:	Eutropius – I, 9–VII, 7 Festus ————— portions of chs. III–XVII
Empire:	Eutropius – VII, 8–X, 18 Festus – XIX–XXX, portions of chs. III–XVII

The difference in emphasis is best illustrated by their respective treatment of the Punic wars: Eutropius devotes three relatively long passages to the wars (1st – II, 18–23; 2nd – III, 7–23; 3rd – IV, 10–12), while Festus is content with ‘ter Africa rebellavit’. Eutropius composed for Valens a history of Roman affairs, internal as well as external, *ab urbe condita*; Festus assembled a handbook, loosely within the *ab urbe condita* tradi-

¹ Cf. Galdi’s remark (p. 233): ‘Eutropio voleva entrare maggiormente nelle grazie dei principi suoi tempi.’

² I have discussed previously the evidence for Festus’ dedication to Valens. Evidence of Eutropius’ dedication is found in the inscriptions of Bambergensis E. III. 22, Bertinianus (St. Omer) 697, and Lincolnensis 100.

tion, in which a short history of the provinces and a resumé of Rome's wars with the Parthians were provided for the Emperor's education. It is difficult to find in these histories great areas of duplication; indeed, they are almost complementary. In short, there is no sufficient reason to doubt that Eutropius and Festus dedicated their histories to the same Emperor, Valens.

Hartke has interpreted Festus' *Breviarium* as an attempt to counterbalance Eutropius' account of Julian's Persian expedition. Citing Festus' 'corrective' assessment in ch. XXVIII: *Iuliano in externos hostes expertae felicitatis principi aduersum Persas modus defuit* – Hartke suggests that Valens, apprehensive of the outcome of his own forthcoming Persian campaign, instructed Festus to diminish Julian's glory by revising Eutropius' account – 'ut omnes Valentis moderationem et sapientiam admirentur'.¹ This account (X, 16), which Hartke considers so laudatory, is brief enough to quote in full:

Aliquot oppida et castella Persarum in deditionem accepit [cp. Festus] vel vi expugnavit Assyriamque populatus castra apud Ctesiphontem stativa aliquamdiu habuit. Remeansque victor . . . hostili manu interfectus est . . .

Eutropius, a participant in the campaign, studiously omits any reference to Julian's disastrous judgment before the gates of Ctesiphon – [Julianus] remeansque victor, on the contrary, implies that the expedition was an unqualified success. Yet, the detailed account by Ammianus Marcellinus (24. 7–25. 3), who could scarcely be termed an opponent of Julian, clearly reveals that the expedition ended in failure. Is it correct, therefore, to label Festus a hired revisionist simply because he mentions the defeat of Julian as well as his victories? Admittedly, Festus is the first historian to record Julian's defeat at Ctesiphon, but this report is corroborated independently and in much greater detail by Ammianus. Moreover, since Julian died during the retreat from Ctesiphon, is not Festus justified in concluding that his *felicitas* had deserted him? In short, I do not feel that Hartke has proved his hypothesis. Festus, in my judgment, has written nothing more than an objective account of the expedition.²

¹ W. Hartke, *De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones* (Lipsiae, 1932), 59, note 3.

² Malcovati (pp. 12–13) in accepting Hartke's hypothesis adds that 'L'ipotesi

The historical method used by Eutropius and Festus in obtaining their information involved the following steps: choice of subject; acquisition of available, relevant histories; accumulation of extracts from these sources pertaining to specific subjects; choice between, combination of, or paraphrasing of these passages; assimilation of these passages in the total corpus. I shall demonstrate below the manner in which Festus applied this method; in Eutropius' history this same process may be discerned. The consensus of scholars is that Eutropius borrowed from the following sources:

Epitome Liviana – Regal period and Republic (I, 1–VI, 16)
 Suetonius 'auctus' – Caesar to Domitian (VI, 17–VIII, 1)
 Kaisergeschichte – Domitian to Julian (VIII, 1–X, 15)¹

Although he paraphrased his sources and thus achieved a less rigid and rudimentary style than Festus, Eutropius adhered in general to the 'method' outlined above. This 'scissors-and-paste' construction makes it difficult to assess the historical judgment and accuracy of either author. In addition, the loss of the principal sources from which Eutropius and Festus borrowed

è tanto più probabile in quanto pare che anche nella vita sua insorta una certa rivalità fra i due autori' – a suggestion first made by Garroni. The argument is this: Festus succeeded Eutropius as *magister memoriae*; Eutropius then became *pro-consul Asiae*: Festus convinced Valens that Eutropius had taken part in the conspiracy of Theodorus; Eutropius was removed from office and was succeeded by Festus. The sources cited in support are Ammianus 29. 1. 36, 2. 22 and Libanius *or.* 1. 159. Festus did succeed Eutropius, but neither source says that he brought about his removal – this is a *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* inference. Moreover, even if Eutropius were the victim of Festus' machinations, how does this support Hartke's hypothesis? This incident occurred a few years after Festus published his *Breviarium*. I cannot discern any necessary connection between this bureaucratic quarrel – if, indeed, there was one – and the contents of Festus' history.

¹ Since Eutropius was contemporary with the events recorded in X, 15–18 and was a participant in Julian's Persian expedition (X, 16), we may assume that he required no source for this information. For the sources used elsewhere see in general W. Pirogoff, *De Eutropii Breviarii indole ac fontibus* (Diss. Berlin, 1873), 37 ff.; C. Wagener, 'Eutropius', *Philologus* 45 (1886), 509 ff.; shorter and less satisfactory is M. Galdi, *op. cit.*, 232. On the Epitome Liviana as a source see H. A. Sanders, *op. cit.*, *passim*. On Suetonius and the 'Kaisergeschichte' see A. Enmann, 'Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser', *Philologus* suppl.-bd. iv, heft 3 (1884), 334 ff. In addition to these sources the following have been proposed: an *Itinerarium*, the *Origo Gentis Romanorum*, Herodian (for 8. 19. 2) and Marius Maximus (for 8. 1–22). These are discussed by Pirogoff, Wagener and Enmann.

precludes any final assessment. In Festus, however, a certain amount of deception and confusion resulting from rhetoric or extreme abbreviation can be detected. An amusing example of Festus' puerile rhetoric is found in his account of Jovian's abortive Persian campaign:

XXIX Persae crebris incursibus nunc a fronte, nunc a tergo mediorum quoque latera incursantes iter agminis morarentur; consumptis aliquot diebus tanta reuerentia Romani nominis fuit, ut . . . reduci confectus inedia exercitus sineretur . . .¹

More frequent is the confusion caused by extreme compression of his sources – for example, in his account of the province of Sicily:

IV Eam (Siciliam) uicto Hierone, Siculorum rege, Marcellus consul obtinuit.

Festus implies in this passage that the capture of Sicily immediately followed the defeat of Hiero. The facts, however, are these: in 263 B.C. Hiero II (King of the Syracusans, not of Sicily) was defeated by M. Valerius Messalla and became an ally of Rome; at the end of the First Punic War Sicily became a Roman province; Hiero died in 215 and was succeeded by his rebellious grandson, Hieronymus (whom Festus has confused with Hiero), who was assassinated in 214; in 211 M. Claudius Marcellus defeated the Syracusans, whose territory then was absorbed in the province of Sicily. Festus' account is only partially incorrect, but completely imprecise. Eutropius, on the other hand, rarely gives way to rhetoric, but in an attempt to condense sources he sometimes induces confusion. More serious is the deception by omission found in his eyewitness account of Julian's Persian expedition. Such examples of rhetorical embellishment, confusion and deception, however, are exceptional. For the most part Eutropius and Festus are content to reproduce intact or to adapt their sources.

On the basis of the foregoing analysis of Eutropius and Festus, we may determine whether any other histories should be classified as *breviaria*. At first glance, the *Origo Gentis Romanorum* seems to meet the specifications: it is an account of the Romans

¹ For other examples of rhetoric see below, pp. 73 ff.

ex quo primum Italia regnare coeperunt to the death of Licinius, compiled from at least two sources (a Suetonian 'expilator' and a chronicon similar to that of Hippolytus).¹ On closer examination, however, some basic distinctions may be discerned. First, unlike the *breviarium*, the *Origo* is not restricted to the *ab urbe condita* pattern, for an account of the kings who ruled Italy before Romulus is provided. Second, the overall presentation – chronological, characterized by extreme brevity, concerned with a few subjects only – parallels the chronicon rather than the *breviarium*. Third, the *Origo* non respexit imperium Romanum, sed solam urbem Romam, nam externa omnia absunt.² Concerning each emperor the *Origo* uniformly presents the following information: name of Emperor, monuments and buildings at Rome planned or erected by him, the size of the *congiaria* which he divided among the people, and the place and date of his death. Finally, neither manuscript of this work – Sangallensis 878 (saec. IX), Vindobonensis 3416 (saec. XV) – suggests a title other than *Origo Gentis Romanorum*. Thus despite some superficial similarities, the *Origo* differs from the *breviaria* of Eutropius and Festus both in form and substance. I consider it a unique chronicon form, rather than a *breviarium*.³

Eutropius and Festus evidently were considered 'auctores' of the second rank throughout the Middle Ages. More than eighty manuscripts of each *Breviarium* have survived: of these eighteen of Festus and eleven of Eutropius were written before the fifteenth century. The simplest explanation of this popularity is that the *breviaria* could be copied quickly. But this advantage, although not unattractive to scribes, does not account for the extracts from Eutropius and Festus found in later histories. The influence of Eutropius has been detected in Jerome, the

¹ Mommsen, *Chronica Minora* I, 141–2.

² *Ibid.*, 141.

³ 'The word "Origo" is used in the general sense of history for which there are several instances in late antiquity', A. Momigliano, 'Some observations on the "Origo Gentis Romanae"', *JRS* 48 (1958), 58 = *Secundo Contributo* (Rome, 1960), 149. One other history should be mentioned in any discussion of the *breviaria* – the tripartite compilation made up of the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, a *De Viris Illustribus*, and Aurelius Victor's *Caesares*. While the title *breviarium* evidently has never been assigned this collection, it is very similar in scope and organization to Eutropius' history.

Epitome de Caesaribus, Ammianus Marcellinus, Augustine, Orosius, Cassiodorus, Jordanes, Isidore, and Bede, while Festus seems to have been a source for Jerome, Ammianus, Jordanes, and Isidore.¹ I think we may say that the breviaria survived and were consulted because they provided a concise survey of Roman history and occasionally information which was not obtainable elsewhere. In short, they were considered useful.

¹ In general, see C. Wagener, 'Eutropius', *Philologus* 42 (1884), 521 ff. In addition, for Jerome see R. Helm, 'Hieronymus und Eutrop', *Rh M* 76 (1927), 138-70, 254-306; for Orosius W. Ensslin, 'Zu Orosius', *Phil. Wochenschr.* (1940), 669 ff.; for *Historia Augusta* E. Hohl, 'Zur Historia-Augusta-Forschung', *Klio* 27 (1934), 149 ff. and W. Hartke, *op. cit.*, 57. On medieval citations of Eutropius see E. Malcovati, *op. cit.*, 18-19. For Festus' influence see C. Wagener, Praefatio to his edition of the *Breviarium* p. xii; M. Galdi, *op. cit.*, 387.

MANUSCRIPTS; EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS; TEXTUAL PROBLEMS

A. MANUSCRIPTS

EDITIONS of the *Breviarium* have appeared fairly frequently since the fifteenth century. A reliable text, however, was not produced until 1874, when W. Foerster published a critical edition based on the best MS traditions. Although he did not collate MSS E, P², or P³, his text is a first-rate accomplishment. In 1886, an improved recension was published by C. Wagener, who re-examined the MSS collected by Foerster, collated MS E, and removed a number of incorrect readings from the text established by Foerster. Yet Wagener did not examine all the early MSS of the *Breviarium*: P² and P³ were not collated. Moreover, unlike Foerster, Wagener included in his apparatus criticus only those MS variants which he considered particularly valuable. As a result, the precise relationship between MS groups cannot be discerned.

I have attempted to examine all the extant MSS and editions of the *Breviarium*, to provide some information concerning the MSS and their interrelationship, and to establish an accurate text based on the best MS traditions. In the MS notes I have included a brief description of each MS, any evidence of origin or provenance, and some indication of distinctive characteristics (e.g. excessive transpositions, orthographic peculiarities). I have listed under additional contents other ancient historical texts pertaining to Roman history which appear with the *Breviarium* in the MSS.

The oldest MS of the *Breviarium* is:

E Escorial Real Biblioteca R. II. 18, perg., *Breviarium* on ff. 35r-44r, written in a mixed uncial hand of the seventh century, undoubtedly in a Spanish scriptorium. Additional contents: excerpt from Eusebius-Jerome, *Chron.*; Prosper, *Chron.* By the ninth century this MS had passed into the collection of the Cathedral Library at Oviedo (f. 95r *Inventarium librorum Ecclesiae Ovetensis* - dated A.D. 882), where it remained throughout the Middle

Ages (on f. 1r, in a sixteenth-century hand, 'De la yglesia mayor de Oviedo'). That E is not the exemplar of any extant MS is proved sufficiently by its peculiar omissions: e.g. 46.18, 67.15. I have excluded from the apparatus criticus most of the frequent orthographic errors found in this MS – confusion of consonants (b for v, d for t, t for th, p for b), interchange of vowels (e for ae, o for u), the omission or addition of initial h. The collation by W. Foerster (*Wiener Studien* 1 [1879], 303–9) is marred by errors and cannot be trusted.

Closely associated with E is a lost MS (α) – produced before the ninth century – which can be reconstructed from four descendants:

W Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek 89 (Salisb. 72), perg., *Breviarium* on ff. 2r–7r, written in a Caroline minuscule hand of the ninth century. The Stiftsbibliothek in Salzburg acquired – or produced – this MS before the end of the tenth century (f. 9r Index librorum post mortem Perththari Frideries [Fridarico] I Archiepiscopo Salisb. [A.D. 958–91] traditorum); the MS evidently remained in the Salzburg area until transferred to the Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek (on inside board – 'codex, pretii quantivis, Salisburgo nobis accessit').

P¹ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 6114, perg., *Breviarium* on ff. 1r–12r, written in a minuscule hand of the eleventh century. The schriftheimat is unknown, but the MS repeats all the omissions, additions, and transpositions found in W. Thus, despite some minor orthographic differences, P¹ may be considered a copy either of W or of a common exemplar. P¹ was checked (e.g. 46.14, 49.17, 55.5) by a second scribe against a rather accurate copy of the α tradition. That the corrector did not have access to a MS outside the tradition is proved by his failure to restore lacunae common to α .

W² Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek 323 (Hist. prof. 1092), perg., *Breviarium* on ff. 29v–45v, written in a minuscule hand of the twelfth century which evinces numerous Gothic forms. Origin unknown. Additional contents: Eutropius, *Brev.*; Eusebius-Jerome, *Chron.* The most prominent characteristic of this MS is its frequent transpositions: e.g. 46.10, 50.17, 59.5.

P² Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale nouv. acq. lat. 310, perg., *Breviarium* (incomplete: ch. XXX is missing) on ff. 96v–103r, written in a minuscule hand of the twelfth century. Additional contents: Eutropius, *Brev.*; Orosius, *Hist.* This MS was in the collection of the abbey of Tegernsee in the fifteenth century (notation 'attinet Tegernsee' appears at end of the volume).

Evidence that MSS W, P¹, W², P² – cited collectively as α – are descended from a common exemplar will be found on almost every page of the apparatus criticus: e.g. common omissions 45.8/9, 46.14, 65.7/8; common additions 48.16, 56.12, 64.6; common changes in word order 47.14, 63.13. Yet, while W, P¹, and W² reproduce primarily the readings of α , P² represents a

contaminated tradition (i.e. P^2 usually reproduces α , but occasionally admits passages obtained from another tradition). This contamination can be detected in the restoration by P^2 of passages omitted by W, P^1 , and W^2 : e.g. 54.4/5, 62.11/12, 62.14. Whether P^2 obtained these restored passages from a previously contaminated exemplar or simultaneously conflated α with another tradition cannot be determined. Thus, for the reconstruction of α we must rely chiefly upon W, P^1 , and W^2 .

The relationship between α and E can be established without difficulty: e.g. common omissions 47.19, 48.15/16, 56.1, 62.9, 68.7/8; common additions 46.6, 49.10, 55.8, 57.7; common changes in word order 46.16, 65.15, 66.3. Indeed, evidence that they are reasonably faithful copies of their exemplars is sufficient to permit the reconstruction of a common archetype – produced before the seventh century – whenever the readings of E and α are identical.

Despite the antiquity of E, of first importance for the reconstruction of the text is:

B Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek E. III. 22, perg., *Breviarium* on ff. 33r–52r, written in Caroline minuscule of the ninth century. Additional contents: Florus, *Epit.* Origin unknown. Descended from a first-rate archetype – ninth century or earlier – this MS is relatively free of the usual scribal errors. There are sufficient omissions, however, to prove that it was not the exemplar of any extant MS: e.g. 55.8, 59.11, 62.18.

The relationship of B and $E\alpha$ is remote. B was not copied from $E\alpha$ (see the numerous peculiar omissions of $E\alpha$) nor was it the exemplar of $E\alpha$ (see the unique omissions of B, in addition to the chronological impossibility). $E\alpha$ regularly differ from B – indeed, the points of convergence are few (e.g. 48.3, 54.6/7). Both traditions, of course, originated from a common source – i.e. either the autograph MS or a later copy – but this descent cannot be reconstructed from the extant MSS.

A lost MS (cited as β) can be reconstructed from four extant descendants:

G Gotha, Landesbibliothek memb. I. 101, perg., *Breviarium* on ff. 1r–8v, written in a Caroline minuscule hand of the ninth century, perhaps at a scriptorium in Germany or Switzerland. Additional contents: Eutropius, *Brev.*; Frontinus, *Strat.* R. Ehwald (*Philologus* 59 [1900], 627 f.; cf. *ABAW* xxiii [1906], 355) argued that Gotha 101 comprises the second half of a Murbach MS listed in Montfaucon's *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum Manuscrip-*

torum Nova (Paris, 1739). Comparison of incipits and contents would seem to support this suggestion. There are two anomalies, however, which are difficult to explain: Festus' *Breviarium* does not appear in the Murbach codex (assuming that Montfaucon's notation is accurate) and Gothanus 101 does not contain the treatises of Augustine found in the Murbach codex. Noting that the first quaternion of Gothanus 101 has only seven leaves and that the binding is modern, Ehwald suggested that the Murbach codex suffered mutilation after 1739: the treatises of Augustine were removed and Festus' *Breviarium* was substituted. This hypothesis, which resolves a number of difficulties, may be accepted. It should be pointed out, however, that Ehwald's analysis does not provide any information about the origin or provenance of the *Breviarium* contained in Gothanus 101. In short, the provenance of the Festus portion of Gothanus 101 may or may not be Murbach. The MS was sold to the Bibliotheca Ducalis at Gotha in 1795 by the Abbé Jean-Baptiste Maugérard. According to K. Christ (*Die Bibliothek des Klosters Fulda im 16 Jahrhundert* [Leipzig, 1933], no. 330 and p. 209) the MS – containing Festus' *Breviarium* and Frontinus, *Strat.* – listed in the sixteenth-century inventory of Fulda is not Gothanus 101. The extensive corrections in this MS were made either by the scribe or by a contemporary second hand. Despite some incorrect conjectures (e.g. 49.12, 49.19, 64.4), the corrections are evidence that G was checked against an accurate MS derived from a good tradition (e.g. 49.13, 64.5, 65.15, 67.1).

P Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 6113a, perg., *Breviarium* on ff. 2r–16r, written in a minuscule hand of the tenth century. Origin unknown. The few corrections, by a second hand, may have been produced through comparison with another MS (perhaps the exemplar itself), but it is possible that they are 'guesses' (e.g. 50.7, 52.4, 54.17).

W¹ Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek 451 (Hist. prof. 600), perg., *Breviarium* on ff. 18r–19v, written in a minuscule hand of the twelfth century. Additional contents: Jordanes, *Romana*. Origin unknown.

P³ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 5822, perg., *Breviarium* on ff. 1r–8r, written in a minuscule hand of the thirteenth century. Origin unknown.

That G and P are descended from a common tradition can be demonstrated by conjunctive errors: e.g. 46.5, 53.5, 57.13, 58.12/13, 63.11, 67.4, 68.12. The relationship, however, between GP and W¹P³ – which were copied from a common exemplar (see 49.7, 50.10, 52.10, 53.4, 53.16/17, 54.4/5, 55.3, 55.12, 57.3, 64.2) – is obscured by contamination. Nonetheless, although W¹P³ seem to incorporate a number of readings from α or its descendants (e.g. 46.6, 46.16, 53.5, 53.12, 57.7, 61.17, 63.19; cf. the passages omitted by GP which are found in W¹P³ – 46.5, 58.12/13, 67.4), it is clear that W¹P³ primarily reproduce an independent tradition (see the restoration by W¹P³ of passages

omitted by α – 45.8/9, 46.14, 47.19, 48.15/16, 56.1, 65.7/8). I cannot discover any evidence to support Hartke's suggestion (*De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones*, 64) that W^1 was corrected by a scribe who had access to W^2 . On the contrary, the scribes of W^1 and P^3 probably copied from a previously conflated, common exemplar.

Since this common exemplar is not extant, the ultimate sources of the conflation – i.e. the MSS representing each of the variant traditions – are difficult to determine. Certainly α or a descendant was used, but from which MS (B or a common tradition represented by G and P) did the scribe of the exemplar obtain the readings omitted by α ? The evidence points to GP, which are indirectly connected with W^1P^3 (common omissions 48.3, 54.6/7, 61.4, 63.13; common errors not found in other extant MSS 56.8, 58.1, 60.13, 61.9, 66.2). While we must admit that W^1P^3 may be related to the tradition represented by B, the absence of common readings, except in conjunction with GP, indicates that this relationship is very remote. In short, GP and W^1P^3 seem to be descendants of a common archetype, which I have designated as β .

The key MS for the reconstruction of the text obviously is B – its relative freedom from the usual scribal errors and the reasonableness of its readings inspire confidence. Certainly there are mistakes – which must be corrected from the other extant MSS – but B is clearly superior to $E\alpha$ and β . The precise relationship between B and the other traditions cannot be determined: B sometimes agrees with $E\alpha$ against β (48.3, 54.6/7, 61.15, 65.9), sometimes with β against $E\alpha$ (see the unique omissions of $E\alpha$ cited above). We may conclude only that B must be related to a very early MS of the *Breviarium*: either a MS copied before the variant traditions $E\alpha$ and β were formed or a MS which embodied some, but not all, of the errors common to each tradition (i.e. B or its exemplar drew from both traditions in their early form, as Hartke p. 64 suggests).

That the *Breviarium* was popular in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is shown by the surprising number of copies produced. One might expect that these MSS, which circulated throughout Europe, would confirm each of the earlier traditions. Collation, however, indicates that the best and earliest

MSS were not consulted or copied. Indeed, all recentiores seem to be derived from the contaminated tradition represented by

Z Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 4659, perg., *Breviarium* on ff. 2r-73r, written in a minuscule hand of the thirteenth century. Its origin is unknown, but the MS belonged at some time to Ancelmus Adurnus (f. 1r. 'liber Ancelmi Adurni') and to the Jesuits of Bruges (f. 2r 'Societatis Iesu Brugis'). Z often reproduces the readings of α , but frequently displays knowledge of another tradition – e.g. restoration of passages omitted by α . Whether Z copied simultaneously from α and another exemplar or obtained the conflated text through a previously contaminated intermediary cannot be determined. Most of the numerous corrections and conjectures (almost invariably historically and philologically inaccurate) may be attributed to the first hand, but some are the work of a corrector. Since Z is hopelessly contaminated, its value for the reconstruction of the text is negligible. Therefore, I have not included the readings of Z in the apparatus criticus.

The late MSS are not homogeneous: some rather faithfully reproduce the Z tradition, while others provide new, but manifestly corrupt, readings arising from additional contamination and/or emendation. Since these late MSS are not essential for the reconstruction of the text of the *Breviarium*, it will suffice merely to list them.

Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 393, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 1r-19r. Additional contents: Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.* On f. 65r: Giustiniani arms of Venice.

Besançon, Bibliothèque Publique 840, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 89r-95r. Additional contents: Florus, *Epit.*; Livy, *Periochae*; Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*; Cicero, *Leg.*, *Acad.*, *Cat.*

Cambridge, University Library Ii. I. 7, chart., s. xvi, *Brev.* ff. 9r-28r. Additional contents: Nepos, *Att.* On f. 29r: 'supra quingentesimum et milesimum quinto calendas iulias'. On inside board: 'ex dono Joannis Hacket lichfieldensis et coventriensis episcopi 1670' (22 December 1661-28 October 1671). On f. 28r: 'e confusissimis exemplaribus transcriptae'.

Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana Plut. XV, perg., s. xiv, *Brev.* ff. 144r-149r. Additional contents: Justinus, *Epit.*; Florus, *Epit.*

Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale 238, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 1r-37v.

Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale 387, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 106r-124v. Additional contents: Josephus, *B7* (book VII), *A7* (book VIII); Suetonius, *vir. ill.* (frag.); Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*

Dublin, Trinity College 280, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 122r-136r. Additional contents: Jerome, *vir. ill.*; Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*; Lucian, frags.

Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek 405, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* f. 155 (incomplete: begins with ch. IX). Additional contents: Orosius, *Hist.*

Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek 620, chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 57r–68v. Additional contents: Cicero, *Orat. Part.*, *Tīmaeus*; Pseudo-Cicero, *De re militari*. Fermo, Biblioteca Comunale 81, perg., s. xiv/xv, *Brev.* ff. 143r–146r. Additional contents: Suetonius, *De vita Caes.*; Livy (fourth decade); Sallust, *Cat.*, *Iug.*; Florus, *Epit.*

Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Plut. 89 inf. 45, chart., s. xv in., *Brev.* ff. 38r–46r. Additional contents: Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*

Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Plut. 68, 29, chart., s. xv ex., *Brev.* ff. 78v–88v. Additional contents: Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*; Florus, *Epit.*

Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Plut. 67. 6, perg., s. xiv ex., *Brev.* ff. 1r–9v. Additional contents: Eutropius, *Brev.* (with continuation of Paulus Diaconus).

Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Plut 66. 38, perg., s. xv in., *Brev.* ff. 130r–139r. Additional contents: Livy, *Periochae*; Florus, *Epit.*; Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.* Possibly the MS listed in the fifteenth-century catalogue of Cosimo de Medici (see A. M. Bandinius, *Bibliotheca Leopoldina Laurentiana*, III [Florence, 1793], 521 ff.)

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 898, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 34r–42r.

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 766, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 253r–260v. This MS seems to have been copied by

London, Brit. Mus. Additional MS 27, 491, chart., s. xvi, *Brev.* ff. 7r–17r.

On f. 1r: 'liber Ieronimi abbatis sancte Flore (Arezzo)'.

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 1166, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 34r–40r.

Glasgow, University Library 344, perg., s. xv ex., *Brev.* ff. 1r–36r.

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit B.P.L. 188, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 55v–67r. Additional contents: Eutropius, *Brev.* (with continuation of Paulus Diaconus); excerpts from various Roman historians (primarily Orosius). On f. 73r: 'in Arcuato pridie Kal<end>as Iunias anno natalis d<omi>ni 1464'.

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit B.P.L. 133 B, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 28v–39v.

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Periz. F. 61, chart., s. xvi, *Brev.* ff. 99v–108v. Additional contents: Eutropius, *Brev.*

London, Lambeth Palace 478, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 73r–75v (chs. I–IV only). On f. 1r: 'Liber Willelmi Horman' (headmaster of Eton, 1535).

London, Brit. Mus. Harleian 2471, perg., s. xiv, *Brev.* ff. 29r–39v. Additional contents: Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.* On f. 1r: 'Liber Thome Wynterburn' (Dean of St. Paul's, London, 1471–8). On f. 3v: 'Liber Willmi Cantuariensis' (William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury in 1504). On f. 4r: 'ex dono Roberti Menevensis Episcopi' (Robert Sherborn, bishop of St. David's, 1505–8), 'Guilielmus Cecill' and 'Ambrosii Bonvici 1687'.

London, Brit. Mus. Egerton 2617, perg., s. xv ex., *Brev.* ff. 53r–66v. Additional contents: Fenestella, *De Mag. Rom.* On f. 1r: 'Liber mei Bartolomei de Palazzo'. Possibly the MS listed in an Italian catalogue of 1451 (see A.

Goldmann, 'Drei Italienische Handschriftenkataloge s. XIII-XV', *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* IV [1887], 143). This MS seems to have been copied by

London, Brit. Mus. Egerton 1118, chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 53r-65v. Additional contents: Fenestella, *De Mag. Rom.*; excerpts from Tacitus; Nepos, *De Hist. Lat.* (*Att.*, *Cat.*). On f. 3r: 'Coll Agen Soc. Iesu Catal. Inscr.'

London, Brit. Mus. Additional MS 26,068, chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 102r-114v. Additional contents: Florus, *Epit.*

London, Brit. Mus. Additional MS 16,411, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 135r-138v. Additional contents: Eutropius, *Brev.*; Eusebius-Rufinus, *HE.* On f. 133r: 'Ambrosius de Florentia'.

Manchester, John Rylands Library, latin 48, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 80r-92r. Additional contents: Florus, *Epit.*; Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*; Livy, *Periochae.* On f. 165r: 'Laurentii Janoti benvenuti . . . ivi (civis?) florentini'.

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana R.I. Sup., chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 84r-95r. Additional contents: Cicero, *AMIC.*, *Sen.*, *ad Brut.*, *Somnium Scipionis.*

Modena, Biblioteca Estense α. O. 6. 23 (lat. 190), chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 75r-87r. Additional contents: Eutropius, *Brev.*

Modena, Biblioteca Estense α. Q. 4. 15 (lat. 437), perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 151r-156r. Additional contents: Nepos, *Att.*, *De Excellentibus Ducibus Exterarum Gentium*; Florus, *Epit.*

Modena, Biblioteca Estense α. K. 1. 25 (lat. 1253), chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 53r-67v. Additional contents: Messala Corvinus, *De progenie Augusti Caesaris.*

Modena, Biblioteca Estense α. O. 6. 21 (lat. 181), perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 57v-66r. Additional contents: Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*; Jerome, *vir. ill.*

Modena, Biblioteca Estense α. T. 7. 14 (lat. 500), chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 499v-506r. Additional contents: Cicero, *Inv. Rhet.* On f. 506r: 'in S. Petro ad aram Neapol.' and 'in festo apostolorum Simonis et Jude 1491'.

Mons, Bibliothèque Publique 530, perg., s. xiv, *Brev.* ff. 1r-7r. On f. 1r: signature of J. B. Lotagrus.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 24,507, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 58r-67v.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 459, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 275r-290v. Additional contents: Cicero, *Deiot.*, *Arch.* Owned by Hartmann Schedel (1440-1514), from which he copied:

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 522, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 10r-26r. Additional contents: Vegetius, *rei militaris.* On f. 26v the letter of L. Blumenauer.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 964, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 66r-80r. Owned by Hartmann Schedel.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 15,772, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 58r-67v.

Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale IV. C. 13, chart., s. xv, folios are not numbered. Additional contents: Caesar, *BC*; anonymous, *Bell. Alex.*, *Bell. Afric.*, *Bell. Hisp.* On last page: 'Feliciter dn . . . (cannot be read) mcccclxii Augusti transcripsit per me Galiacium Ytzenzerotis (?)'.

Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale IV. C. 31, chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 111r-119v. Additional contents: Florus, *Epit.*; Livy, *Periochae*.

Oxford, All Souls 47, chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 160r-171v. Additional contents: Prosper, *Chron.* Owned by Phillip Polton, Archdeacon of Gloucester in 1428, who bequeathed the MS to All Souls in 1461. Possibly the MS bought by Candido Decembrio for Duke Humphrey of Gloucester (see B. L. Ullmann, *Studies in the Italian Renaissance* [1955], 350-1).

Oxford, Corpus Christi 84, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 24v-35r. Additional contents: Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.* On inside board, after table of contents: 'Quod ego Jo. (John Shirwode) Dunelmensis episcopus (26 May 1484-12 January 1494), emi Londoniis circiter XI kalendas Januarii anno Domini 1464. Scriptum anno Domini 1491, 21 die Aprilis et consecrationis meae anno septimo'.

Padua, Biblioteca Antoniana 19, chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 118v-122r (incomplete: chs. VIII-XXIV omitted). Additional contents: Caesar, *BC* (frag. of book I); Lucian, frags.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 4833, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 50r-68v. Additional contents: Pomponius Mela. See T. de Marinis, *La Biblioteca Napoletana dei Re d'Aragona* (Milan, 1947), II, 106-7 and plate 169.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 5791, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 94r-109r. Additional contents: Florus, *Epit.* On f. 93r: 'anno domini 1458 III non. Ianuar Mediolani'. Listed in the inventory made in 1469 of the library of the Castle of Pavia owned by Galeazzo Maria Sforza (see E. Pellegrin, *La Bibliothèque des Visconti et des Sforza* [Paris, 1955], 330).

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 5831, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 374r-381v. Additional contents: Plutarch, various *vitae parallelae*: Nepos, *Att.*

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 5879, perg., s. xvi, *Brev.* ff. 147r-155r.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 8749, chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 84r-94r.

Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 1599, chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 25r-48r. Additional contents: Messala Corvinus, *De Progenie Augusti Caesaris*.

Pistoia, Biblioteca Forteguerriana A-32 (26), chart., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 146r-154v. Additional contents: Cicero, various orations. Colophon on f. 154v: ἡ βίβλος τοῦ Κοζομένου [Sozomeno da Pistoia] τέλος ἀγαθὴ τύχη.

Poitiers, Bibliothèque Municipale 244, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 1r-5r. On f. 1r: 'Collegium Pictavensis societ. Iesu Catal. ascript.' and 'Dono domini de la Frézelière'. At the end of the volume: 'iste cronice sunt Guidonis, episcopi ducis Lingonensis, anno Domini M cccc lvi'.

Poznan. I have not seen this MS, nor have I been able to confirm its existence. According to C. Benecke, who examined the MS at Poznan and published a collation in *Program des Kgl. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Gymnasiums zu Posen* (1839), it was written in the fifteenth century. That the MS belongs to the Z tradition can be determined easily from the collation. Additional contents: Florus, *Epit.*; Frontinus, *Strat.*

Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale 1131, perg., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 103r-107r. Additional contents: Eusebius-Jerome-Prosper, *Chron.*

Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek Hist. 152, chart., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 90v-99v. Additional contents: Florus, *Epit.*; Tacitus, *Germania*. On f. 89 of preceding work, the *Epitome Historiae Romanae* by Candido Decembrio: 'scripsit nostro tempore Neapoli'. MS was purchased from the monastery of Komburg (olim Nr. 64).

Toledo, Biblioteca Capitulares 13-15, perg., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 299r-306v.

Trento, Biblioteca Communale 3184, perg., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 103r-114v.

Trento, Biblioteca Communale 3224, perg., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 1r-15r.

Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale 773 (E-V-34), perg., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 52r-63r. Additional contents: Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*

Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale 1102 (G-V-34), chart., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 1r-11r. Additional contents: Cicero, *Quinct.*

Vatican, Cod. Urb. Lat. 411, perg., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 54r-58v. Additional contents: Messala Corvinus, *De Progenie Augusti Caesaris*; Pseudo-Aurelius Victor, *Epitome de Caesaribus*; Justinus, *Epit.*; Sallust, *suas., epist.* On f. 3v: 'Manu Federici Urbinate Imperante Federico Urbinatum magnanimo Duce semper invicto, cunctarum virtutum alumno'.

Vatican, Cod. Reg. Lat. 372, perg., s. xiv, *Brev. ff.* 99r-101r (incomplete: begins at end of ch. XI).

Vatican, Cod. Barb. Lat. 139, chart., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 59r-87v. Additional contents: Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*

Vatican, Cod. Vat. Lat. 1860, perg., s. xiv, *Brev. ff.* 71r-92r. Additional contents: Florus, *Epit.*; Suetonius, *De vita Caes.*; Vegetius, *rei militaris*; Eutropius, *Brev.*; Sallust, *Cat., Jug.*; Justinus, *Epit.*; Frontinus, *Strat.* On f. 79v: 'explicit liber quartus anno domini 1313'.

Vatican, Cod. Vat. Lat. 939, chart., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 273v-276r. Additional contents: Jerome, *vir. ill.*; Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.* On f. 276r is the subscription 'deo gracias amen, anno 1433 die v septembris'.

Vatican, Cod. Vat. Lat. 1522, chart., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 105r-118r.

Vatican, Cod. Vat. Lat. 10936, chart., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 1v-17r.

Vatican, Cod. Vat. Lat. 11,453, chart., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 45r-58r. Additional contents: Cicero, *Somnium Scipionis*.

Vatican, Cod. Vat. Lat. 11,460, chart., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 146v-156r. Additional contents: Pliny, *epist.* (books I-IV); Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*

Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek 199 (Univ. 391), perg., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 19r-30r. Additional contents: Nepos, *verba Gracchorum*.

Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek 254 (Univ. 236), perg., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 29v-38r. Additional contents: Nepos, *De Excellentibus Ducibus Exterarum Gentium*; Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*

Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek 3091 (Hist. prof. 513), perg., s. xv, *Brev. ff.* 1r-5v. Additional contents: Pseudo-Pliny, *vir. ill.*

Vienna, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek 3462 (Philol. 229), perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 136r–145v. Additional contents: Cicero, various epistles.

Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek Gudianus Lat. 322 (4629), chart., s. xv/xvi, *Brev.* ff. 1r–17r.

In addition to these, two manuscripts contain Festus interpolated with other material:

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 528, perg., s. xv, *Brev.* ff. 35r–51r.

Tournai, Ville Cod. 135, perg., s. xiii, *Brev.* ff. 59r–63r (passages of Eutropius interpolated with Festus, ch. II ff.). Additional contents: Livy, *Periochae*; Orosius, *Hist.*; miscellaneous excerpts from Roman histories. This MS was destroyed in 1940.

Finally, a number of MSS – no longer extant, or at least not identifiable – are listed in medieval and Renaissance inventories (most of these are noted by M. Manitius, *Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen*, *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, Beiheft 67 [Leipzig, 1935], 191).

Biblioteca Fr. Petrarchae, inventory of 1337 (see Manitius).

Bibliotheca Avenionensis, no. 859, inventory of 1375. Contained Sidonius Apollinaris, Suetonius, Caesar, Eutropius, Festus, Florus, and the *Periochae* of Livy (see Manitius).

Biblioteca Estense, nos. 100, 129, inventory of 1436 (see Manitius).

Biblioteca di Borso d'Este, inventory of 1467 (see Manitius).

Biblioteca Pandolfini, no. C. 11, s. xv. Contained Florus, Festus, Nepos, Hippocrates, Diogenes, Tacitus (see Manitius).

Biblioteca Medicea Fesulana, no. 86, s. xv. Contained Sallust, Florus, Festus, Pseudo-Pliny, Suetonius (see Manitius).

Biblioteca San Daniele del Friuli, inventory of 1461 by Guarnerio d'Artagna. Contained Pseudo-Pliny, Festus, Florus (see G. Mazzatinti, *Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia*, III [Forlì, 1893], 104).

Bibliotheca Fuldensis, no. 330, inventory of sixteenth century. Contained Festus, Frontinus (see K. Christ, *Die Bibliothek des Klosters Fulda im 16. Jahrhundert* [Leipzig, 1933], 209).

I have indicated in the description of each fourteenth- to sixteenth-century MS the classical historical literature, if any, which appears with the *Breviarium*. Tabulation of this information (p. 32) (excluding the contents of MSS listed in inventories, which clearly reflect a similar pattern) reveals the popularity of short histories of Rome in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Although the MSS containing the *Breviarium* do not necessarily constitute a representative sampling of late medieval/Renaissance MSS, the regular appearance of Pseudo-Pliny,

	XIVth	XVth	XVIth	Total
Pseudo-Pliny, <i>Vir. Ill.</i>	1	16		17
Florus, <i>Epitome</i>	3	10		13
Cicero: <i>Leg., Acad., Cat., Amic., Sen., Ad Brut., Somnium Scipionis, Orat. Part., Timaeus, Deiot., Arch., Inv. Rhet., Quinct., Epistles;</i> Pseudo-Cicero, <i>De Re Militari</i>		9		9
Nepos: <i>Att., Cat., De Exc. Duc. Ext. Gent., Verba Gracchorum</i>		5	1	6
Eutropius, <i>Brev.</i>	2	3	1	6
Livy, <i>Periochae</i>		4		4
Justinus, <i>Epitome</i>	2	1		3
Suetonius: <i>Vir. Ill.</i> (frag.), <i>De Vita Caes.</i>	2	1		3
Sallust: <i>Cat., Jug., Suas., Ep.</i>	2	1		3
Messala Corvinus, <i>De Progenie Aug. Caes.</i>		3		3
Jerome, <i>Vir. Ill.</i>		2		2
Prosper, <i>Chron.</i>		2		2
Tacitus: excerpta, <i>Germania</i>		2		2
Caesar: <i>BC</i> ; anonymous, <i>BAlex., BAfr., BHisp.</i>		2		2
Vegetius, <i>Rei Militaris</i>	1	1		2
Frontinus, <i>Strat.</i>	1	1		2
Fenestella, <i>De Mag. Rom.</i>		2		2
Lucian, fragments		2		2
Livy, 4th Decade	1			1
Orosius, <i>Hist.</i>		1		1
Eusebius-Jerome, <i>Chron.</i>		1		1
Eusebius-Rufinus, <i>HE.</i>		1		1
Pliny, <i>Ep.</i>		1		1
Josephus, <i>B7, A7</i>		1		1
Plutarch, <i>Vit.</i>		1		1
Pseudo-Aurelius Victor, <i>Epit. de Caes.</i>		1		1

Florus, Nepos, Eutropius, and the *Periochae* suggests that the knowledge of Roman history in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries was based at least in part on epitomes, biographical sketches, and breviaria composed during the Empire.

B. EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

SINCE the fifteenth century a number of scholars have attempted to establish the text of the *Breviarium*. Unfortunately, these editors did not have access to the best MSS – indeed, with three exceptions, they produced texts based upon collations of

previous printed editions and inferior late medieval/Renaissance MSS (from the tradition represented by Z).

In 1468 Sixtus Reusinger published the *editio princeps* – bound with Pseudo-Pliny, *Vir. Ill.* – at Rome. This edition is nothing more than a copy of a late MS and contributes nothing to the reconstruction of the text. Two years later Francisco Campanus published a similarly corrupt text at Rome: pp. 559v–563r in the *editio princeps* of Plutarch's *Vitae*. This edition went through a number of impressions (Rome, 1472; Venice, 1478, 1496, 1502). A slightly different text, but still manifestly corrupt, was published anonymously in 1472, together with the *De Aedificatione Venetiarum*. In 1474 Angelus Tiphernas published a text based on the Z tradition prefaced by a brief sketch of Italian history before Romulus (epistle to Baptista de Ursinis precedes the text). This edition enjoyed considerable popularity and was frequently reprinted (1490, 1491, 1492, 1510, 1513, 1514).

The first commentary on the *Breviarium* was published by Joannes Camers in 1518 at Vienna (prefatory epistle to Benedictus Bekenius). Camers states that his text is based on a collation of printed editions and exemplars – the latter, however, were from the Z tradition and provided no new readings. Enhanced by the addition of a commentary, primarily historical, this edition was reprinted frequently (Paris, 1519, 1552, 1560; Basle, 1532; Cologne, 1540). In 1530 Niccolò Perotti's translation of Polybius (first published at Rome in 1473), together with a text of the *Breviarium*, was published at Basle. This edition of the *Breviarium* (by Perotti?) – in which ch. I and part of ch. II are omitted – seems to be a collation of previous editions only. In 1553 Joannes Cuspinianus provided a text with extensive commentary, both philological and historical, in which he denounced all previous editors. The text – a collation of editions and exemplars (undoubtedly from the Z tradition) according to Cuspinianus – is scarcely an improvement on the products of previous editors and is marred further by numerous infelicitous emendations, some of which appear in later editions. Cuspinianus' edition was reprinted twice (Frankfurt, 1601; Amsterdam, 1630). In the same year a text was published at Lyons, which seems to be merely a collation of previous editions. Johannes Otho, in his *Introductio in Historiam Romanam* (Bruges, 1565),

printed a text of the *Breviarium* which enjoyed some popularity (reimpressions: Arles, 1609; Evreux, 1621; Amsterdam, 1625) and was the basis of the text by F. Sylburgius (Frankfurt, 1587). Otho does not indicate the editions or MSS from which he obtained his text, but its multifarious errors can be traced to the Z tradition.

In 1632 a considerable improvement in the text was accomplished by M. Z. Boxhorn. His edition (published at Leiden, in *Historiae Augustae Scriptorum Latinorum minorum*, II, 662–87), with an introductory ‘vita et scripta Festi’ taken from G. J. Vossius’ *De Historicis Latinis*, vol. III, marks the first consultation of an early MS tradition since the thirteenth century. The text is remarkably accurate and certainly was the best available edition until the end of the nineteenth century (reprinted with meagre philological notes by M. C. Iuncker in 1704 [Leipzig/Frankfurt] and in 1796 at Paris). Unfortunately, later editors – with the exception of B. C. Haurisius, *Scriptores Historiae Romanae Latini veteres*, II, 161–7 (Heidelberg, 1743), who evidently knew the Boxhorn edition, but regularly chose readings from an inferior tradition – either disregarded or did not know this edition.

The edition of Christopher Cellarius (Cizae, 1678; reprinted Halle, 1698) – which reverted to the corrupt tradition and seems to be merely a collation of previous editions – was incorporated and expanded by H. Verheyk in 1762 (reprinted Leipzig, 1793). In his preface Verheyk states that his edition is based on a collation of six MSS ‘cum notis integris F. Sylburgii, C. Cellarii, et W. Havercampi’ (who merely published an annotated edition of Cellarius’ text at Leiden in 1729). The net result is a freely emended Z tradition. The edition published by the Societas Bipontina in 1789 (in *Historiae Romanae Scriptores minores*, 211–30) similarly did nothing to improve the text. G. Munnich (Hanover, 1815), in a treatise on Festus ‘in usum scholarum’, which precedes his edition, provided an analysis of all previous editions and listed the MSS known to him. From this list of MSS we can determine the readings available to him – all the MSS are from the Z tradition. Although Munnich knew the Boxhorn edition, he does not seem to have incorporated its readings. This was the last edition based exclusively on the Z

tradition; in 1874 the edition produced by W. Foerster superseded all previous recensions.

The *Breviarium* has been translated into three modern languages: into Italian, with a commentary, by Ludovico Dolce under the title *La Dignita de' Consoli e de gl' Imperatori e i fatti de' Romani* (Vinegia, 1560, 1561); into French by N. A. Dubois (Paris, 1843) and by J. M. N. Nisard (Paris, 1851), both with commentary; into Spanish by D. F. Navarro y Calvo (Madrid, 1889-90).

C. TEXTUAL PROBLEMS

I HAVE noted above (p. 25) that MS B reproduces the most reliable text of the *Breviarium* transmitted from antiquity. In reconstructing the text, therefore, I have often preferred the readings of this MS to all others. But B is not perfect: its few, obvious lacunae must be restored from the other extant MSS. Moreover, certain errors are common to all early MSS of the *Breviarium* – i.e. these errors seem to antedate the split (before the seventh century, the paleographical date of E) which produced E α , β , and B. In order to reconstruct the text the character and origin of these errors must be determined: are they scribal errors, errors of transmission, or are they historical errors committed by Festus? I am not concerned here with errors found in only one variant tradition; the authenticity of these usually can be determined by examination of the MS transmission. But since analysis of the MSS alone cannot establish the authenticity and antiquity of the errors common to all early MSS, we must rely upon independent evidence. To this end Jordanes' *Romana* (written in A.D. 551), which preserves an indirect tradition, is indispensable.

Mommsen, in his edition of the *Romana* (MGH: AA v, 1 [1882]), pointed out the numerous and unmistakable parallels between Festus and Jordanes in chs. 210-91 (occasionally elsewhere: e.g. chs. 87, 111-14). Mommsen's conclusion that Jordanes borrowed directly from Festus, however, has been challenged by W. Ensslin (*SBAW*, Phil-hist. Kl., Heft 3 [1948]). Ensslin argues that 'eine Zwischenquelle' supplied the readings from Festus and suggests that this source was the *Historia*

Romana published (but no longer extant) by Symmachus. An assessment of his analysis is not required here. It will suffice to note that Ensslin never suggests that the parallel readings should be attributed to Symmachus, but rather admits that these readings were derived from Festus and incorporated in Symmachus' *Romana*. In short, everyone agrees that Festus was the ultimate source of these parallels. The sections of Festus reproduced in Jordanes, therefore, may be considered an indirect tradition of great value in determining the authenticity and antiquity of 'errors' found in the MSS of the *Breviarium*.

The principle may be stated succinctly: errors common to Jordanes and the extant MSS are historical errors committed by Festus; errors found in the extant MSS, but not confirmed by the parallel passages in the *Romana*, may be considered scribal errors. It is possible, of course, that Jordanes obtained his readings from an intermediate copy of the *Breviarium* (i.e. a MS produced between 369/70 and 551) which contained errors. Such hypothetical obstacles to the principle outlined above cannot be dismissed out of hand, but neither should they inhibit conclusions based on a careful analysis of the extant evidence. That Festus should reproduce historical errors in the *Breviarium* is not surprising. His historical method, which may be observed in those passages extracted from extant histories, is simple enough: select, excise, incorporate. Quite often he merely transmits information culled from other histories; in the process he is susceptible to all the errors which plagued the medieval scribe.

All the errors are not confirmed by the *Romana*, for Jordanes (or Symmachus) obtained information from a variety of sources – e.g. Florus, Jerome – and thus many sections of the *Breviarium* have no parallel in the *Romana*. To authenticate errors found in the MSS in these sections we must test the probability of scribal error by examination of the MS transmission.

The following discussion of significant errors and uncertain readings should illustrate the principles which I have followed in reconstructing the text. References are to page and line number in the text.

48.6 AB AUGUSTO CAESARE: All the early MSS read Augusto. Since Julius Caesar defeated Juba I (see below p.

105), this reading is clearly an error – probably committed by Festus. Unfortunately, Jordanes – who seems to follow Festus in *Rom.* 210/11 – does not mention the conqueror of Juba.

48.14 USQUE GADIS: The Romans did not penetrate to Gadis under Brutus (see below p. 106). The MSS, however, uniformly read Gadis (or Gades: EP²). The most probable explanation of this error is that Festus has written Gadis or Gades for Cales, the port at the mouth of the Douro. Since this hypothesis cannot be confirmed, however, I have not emended the text.

48.15 SYLLA: Commenting on this passage Münzer (*RE* x, 1 [1917], 1094, n. 169) observed that ‘da kein Sulla bekannt ist der in dieser Zeit in Spanien tätig war, so ist die Änderung “Silanus” statt “Sylla” wohl möglich.’ ‘Die Änderung’ first appears in MS Z (s. XIII) and is found in all Renaissance editions – often augmented by Decius Junius. This emendation, which is not supported by other sources, is not acceptable. Not only is the reading Sylla found in the early MSS (E α B β), but it is reproduced also in Jordanes, *Rom.* 212: rursusque resistentibus [Spaniis] Sylla consul sedavit. Since the rest of ch. 212 (as well as chs. 211 and 213) seems to derive from Festus, we may assume that Jordanes borrows from Festus at this point – i.e. Sylla.

On the basis of this evidence, the alternative emendation proposed by R. Jacobi (*De Festi Breviarii fontibus*, 29) – a Sylla missus exercitus – also is unnecessary and should be resisted. Obviously, the silence of other historians – e.g. Appian, Plutarch – concerning a Spanish campaign under Sulla renders Festus’ account suspicious. Yet, even if Sulla is an historical error, it is an error committed by Festus and should not be emended.

49.11 APUD ALLIAM FLUVIUM: This addition after Romanis, which is found in MSS E α , is historically accurate and may be authentic. More probably, however, these words are a marginal gloss on caesis exercitibus Romanis, which was accepted early in the transmission by one group of MSS. For this reason I have not added the words to the text.

51.6 AN<I>CIUM: A number of variants are found in the MSS: Ancilium (E α), Ancium (BG), Mancium (P), Mantuum

(W¹), Mantium (P³). Lucius Anicius is clearly the correct name (see below p. 115). The letter i probably dropped out through scribal miscopying – perhaps through confusion with the preceding letter n. Therefore, with Foerster I have restored the missing letter.

51.8 MOESIOS: The adjective Moesiacos (variations of which appear in all MSS) is grammatically incorrect in context. I have preferred Moesios, which is confirmed by Jordanes *Rom.* 216: Dardanos Mysosque.

52.8 MOESIAM <SUPERIOREM, DARDANIAM>: With regard to the number of provinces in Illyricum a curious textual problem exists. The early MSS present three different readings: decem et octo or XVIII (EGP), decem et septem or XVII (B α), and decem et novem or X et VIII (W¹P³). Each, however, lists only seventeen provinces. This conflict is resolved by Jordanes *Rom.* 218, for which Festus seems to have been the source: Illyricus . . . quae habet intra se provinciae XVIII et sunt Norice duo, Pannonias duas, Valeria, Suavia, Dalmatia, Moesia superior, Dardania, Dacias duas, Macedonia, Thessalia, Achaia, Epyros duos, Praevales, Creta, simul XVIII. The appearance of superior, Dardania in Jordanes suggests that these words originally were in the *Breviarium*. They had disappeared before the Escorial copy was made (perhaps through haplography – *Moesiam . . . Dardaniam*), but the existence of Dardania in the list may be signified by the number decem et octo in E and XVIII in GP. However, confusion of numerals in MSS is common, and this evidence alone is not sufficient. In support we may point to the preceding sentence in ch. VIII which clearly indicates that Festus knew that Dardania was a province of Illyricum: duae Daciae in regionibus Moesiae ac Dardaniae factae sunt. Indeed, every fourth-century provincial list includes Dardania among the provinces of Illyricum. The existence of Dardania in the list cannot be proved, but the evidence seems sufficient to justify restoration. The insertion of superior is less secure, but its appearance in Jordanes suggests that it too originally was included.

53.5 UOCATUR: I have based my rejection of nominatur on MS B (vocatur) and Jordanes *Rom.* 221 (vocitantur).

54.14 MUMMIUS: Mummius certainly is historically inaccurate (see below p. 121), but no MS supports the emendation to Manlius. Jordanes *Rom.* 224 reads Manlius, but in this passage he is excerpting Florus 1. 27. I believe that Mummius is an historical error committed by Festus and should not be emended to Manlius (as did Foerster).

55.2 APAFRACE: Since the events described by Festus must be dated to the reign of Ariarathes IV (see below p. 122), we may assume that Apafrace is a faulty transcription of the unfamiliar Greek name Ariarathes – i.e. Festus may have written *APIAPAΘHC*, which was miscopied as APAFRACE (the reading in B). This reading was disfigured further in other MSS – Epafrace β, Afracere E, Africae α. Jordanes (*Rom.* 225) evidently obtained Epafra from the MS tradition represented by β.

55.8 CLAUDIO: Archelaus was summoned to Rome by Tiberius (see below p. 123), and thus Claudio, supported by all early MSS, is an historical error. Since Claudio also appears in Jordanes *Rom.* 225, we may conclude that this is one of Festus' historical mistakes.

59.8 SYRIAE: Pompey acquired Syria from Tigranes (see below p. 130), but all the early MSS of the *Breviarium* read Syriae. The MS reading, in my view, is authentic and historically accurate. Syriae probably reflects the altered status of Syria in 369/70 – i.e. the old province of Syria had been divided into Syria Coele and Euphratensis. Festus evidently 'translated' his source (cf. ch. X, s.v. Asia) so that his readers would more readily comprehend the geographical reference.

60.11 LUCIUS: Lucius is supported by all early MSS, but Gaius is the correct praenomen. Jordanes does not mention Cassius in his discussion of Crassus' Parthian campaign (*Rom.* 236), and thus the authenticity of the error cannot be tested independently. Nonetheless, since we have no reason to reject our only piece of evidence at this point, the MS transmission, we may accept Lucius. In short, Lucius is an historical error committed by Festus.

60.18 CAPRO: Hartke (*De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones*, 47, note d) suggests that Capro is an

error for Tauro (cf. Dio 48. 39. 4); Foerster and Wagener emended the text to read Tauro. Admittedly mons Caprus cannot be identified and quite possibly is an error, but emendation does not resolve the vital question of origin. Is this another of Festus' errors or is it the result of scribal miscopying? Jordanes (*Rom.* 237) does not locate the battle – he seems to follow Florus 2. 19 in this passage. Once again I think we must accept the uniform MS transmission – Capro – and attribute the error, if indeed it is an error, to Festus.

61.12 CLAUDIUS (also 61.16, 61.20, 62.1): Claudius is clearly an error for Gaius, but the text should not be emended (as did Foerster) in view of Jordanes *Rom.* 240: per Claudium Caesarem nepotem Augusti. Careless expansion of the abbreviation for Gaius (C.) in his source may have led to the error by Festus.

65.9 NULLO EAM OBSISTENTE: The MSS do not agree at this point: nullo ei obsistente E α , nullo eam obsistente B, nullo obsistente (ei/eam, omitted) β . In E α , of course, we should expect the reflexive sibi (cf. *Vita Cari* 8. 1 nullo sibi occurrente), but in late Latin the rules were not always observed. Even if ei = sibi is accepted as a late Latin usage, one may doubt that Festus wrote nullo ei obsistente. In a similar passage (68.4) nullo prohibente, without the pronoun, is found. This parallel suggests that ei may be an error – perhaps, for eam = Persidam (B). Hartke (*op. cit.*, 64) emended the passage to nullo obsistente eam. In support he cited a similarly constructed sentence in ch. XI: Mummius pro consule Galatas persecutus est et . . . de arduis eos plana detrusit. I am not convinced by Hartke's analysis and have preferred the reading in MS B (Foerster and Wagener read ei).

66.19 CONSTANTIENSI: Since the Persian war under Constantius is the subject of ch. XXVII Constantiensi must be the correct reading (found only in W²). Constantiniensi, the reading in most MSS, therefore, is a scribal error.

All significant errors in EB $\alpha\beta$ have been included in the apparatus criticus, but the readings of Z and other late copies have been omitted. Orthographic errors usually have not been included unless (1) they have inaugurated a variant tradition

and/or have led to error or (2) there is some question about the correct reading (e.g. Phoenice or Foenice, Hadrianopolis or Adrianopolis). Frequently the extant MSS of the α or β tradition offer conflicting readings, and thus these exemplars (hyparchetypes) cannot be reconstructed. At these points, therefore, I either have recorded the readings of each MS or have indicated the single variants or minority readings within a tradition by () – e.g. 46.18 Liburni (a) P α indicates that one MS of the α tradition (W²) reads Liburnia.

BREVIARIUM

SIGLA

- E Escorialensis R. II. 18, s. VII
 α Archetypus codicum W P¹ W² P²
 W Vindobonensis 89, s. IX
 P¹ Parisinus 6114, s. XI
 W² Vindobonensis 323, s. XII
 P² Parisinus nouv. acq. lat. 310, s. XII
 B Bambergensis E. III. 22, s. IX
 β Archetypus codicum G P W¹ P³
 G Gothanus 101, s. IX
 P Parisinus 6113a, s. X
 W¹ Vindobonensis 451, s. XII
 P³ Parisinus 5822, s. XIII
 f ed. W. Foerster (1874)
 w ed. C. Wagener (1886)
 Eutropius Eutropius, *Breviarium* (ed. Droysen)
 Iord. Jordanes, *Romana* (ed. Mommsen)
 Hartke W. Hartke, *De saeculi quarti exeuntis
historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones*
(Lipsiae, 1932)
 Jacobi R. Jacobi, *De Festi Breviarii fontibus*
(Bonn, 1874)

I. Breuem fieri clementia tua praecepit. Parebo libens praecepto, quippe cui desit facultas latius eloquendi; ac morem secutus calculonum, qui ingentes summas aeris breuioribus exprimunt, res gestas signabo, non eloquar. Accipe ergo, quod breuiter dictis breuius computetur: ut annos et aetatem rei publicae ac praeteriti facta temporis non tam legere tibi, gloriosissime princeps, quam numerare uidearis.

5

II. Ab urbe condita in ortum perennitatis uestrae, quo prosperius fratrum imperium Roma sortita est, anni numerantur MCXVII. Sic sub regibus anni numerantur CCXLIII, sub consulibus anni CCCCLXVII, sub imperatoribus anni CCCCVII. Regnarunt Romae per annos CCXLIII reges numero VII. Romulus regnavit annos XXXVIII; senatores per quinos dies annum unum; Numa Pompilius regnavit annos XLIII; Tullus Hostilius regnavit annos XXXII; Ancus Marcius regnavit annos XXIII; Priscus Tarquinius regnavit annos XXXVIII; Servius Tullius regnavit annos XLIII; Lucius Tarquinius Superbus expulsus regno est, anno XXIII. Consules fuerunt a Bruto et

10

15

Incipit: Breviarium Festi de Breviario rerum gestarum Populi Romani EBP De Breviario rerum gestarum Populi Romani G Breviarium Festi rerum gestarum Populi Romani WP¹W² Liber Rufini de gestis Romanorum P² Pio perpetuo Valentiniano domino imperatori semper Ruffus Festus v.c. add. α 1 praeceptis Eα 2 ac: ae P more E 3 secutus: sectandi (*expunctis litteris* andi, *litterae* ume manu recentiore supra scriptae sunt) P calculatorum EW²P² calcatorum WP¹ inter gentes E aeris: ceris α 4 quod: que E, om. W²P² 5 beviter P dicta α computentur E et, om. GW¹P³ anos hanc cecitatem E annosam vetustatem α 6 tibi, om. Eα 7 gloriose Eα enumerare P² audearis E 8 igitur post urbe add. αW¹P³ 8/9 quo . . . est, om. α 9 imperii Romani E 10 MCXVII: CCCXVII BP sic, om. α anni (post regibus), om. Eα CCXLIII: CCXLIII P³ 11 anni (post consulibus), om. α anni (post imperatoribus), om. α CCCCVII: CCCCVI G 12 regnaverunt Eα CCXLIII: CCXLIII EW¹P³ VII: VIII P 13 XXXVI WP² annos, om. G XLIII W¹P³ 14 Tullius Eα 15 XXXI E Ancus, om. E Marcus BGPW² 16 XXXIII E XXIII P¹ Tarquinius Priscus α Servilius EG (*statim corr.* P³) 17 Tullus BPW¹P³ Lucius: Lucinius G, om. α 18 qui ante expulsus add. PW¹P³ a post expulsus add. P regno, om. B annos β XXXIII E XXXIII β XXV α XXV anno W²

Publicola in Pansam et Hirtium numero DCCCCXVI, praeter eos
 qui in eundem annum sorte aliqua sunt subrogati, per annos
 CCCCLXVII. Nouem enim annis Romae consules defuerunt, ita
 5 tribus, sine magistratibus Roma fuit annis quattuor. Impera-
 tores ab Octauiano Caesare Augusto in Iouianum fuerunt
 numero XLIII per annos CCCCVII.

III. Sub his igitur tribus imperandi generibus, hoc est regio
 consulari imperatorio, quantum Roma profecerit, breuiter
 10 intimabo. Sub regibus septem per annos CCXLIII non amplius
 quam usque Portum atque Ostiam intra octauum decimum
 miliarium a portis urbis Romae, utpote adhuc paruae et a
 pastoribus conditae, cum finitimae circum ciuitates premerent,
 Romanum processit imperium. Sub consulibus, inter quos non-
 15 numquam et dictatores fuerunt, per annos simul CCCCLXVII
 Italia usque trans Padum occupata est, Africa subacta est,
 Hispaniae accesserunt, Galliae et Britanniae tributariae factae
 sunt. De Illyrico Histri Libyrni Dalmatae domiti sunt, ad
 Achaïam transitum est, Macedones subacti, cum Dardanis
 20 Moesis et Thracibus bellatum est, et ad Danuuium usque
 peruentum. In Asia expulso Antiocho primum pedem posuere
 Romani, Mithridate uicto Pontus regnum eius occupatum est,

1 in: usque W² Hirtium: stium E Hyrtacium W² irtium B Hirticum G
 CCCCCXVII EW² quadringenti decem et septem WP¹ XLXVII P²
 DCCCCXVII P³ praeter: propter G 3 CCCCCXLVII E nouem enim annis:
 etenim annos E enim, *om.* α consules, *om.* E ita, *om.* α 4 decemuiris:
 decem annis E iuris deorum W¹ sub: sed W¹P³ 5 sine magistra-
 tibus, *om.* GP 6 usque *ante* in *add.* EαW¹P³ Iovinianum P²
 7 numero: anni B, *om.* Eα LXIII E XLIII W¹P³ 8 igitur, *om.* W²
 tribus, *om.* P 9 consulario B profecerat P 10 septem *ante* sub *tr.*
 W² CCLXIII E 11 Portum, *om.* P² atque: ad P² Hostiam *codd. praeter*
 BP¹ 12 Rome urbis P³ ut porte W¹ a, *om.* G 13 eam *post*
 ciuitates *add.* W² 14 Romanum . . . imperium, *om.* α imperium, *om.* E
 inter: in EWW² (*manu rec. corr.* P¹) 15 CCCCCXLVII B 16 ita usque
 trans Padum Italia EαW¹P³ est, *om.* Eα 17 Spaniae EWP¹W² cesse-
 runt Eα Britanniae Eα Britanniae W¹P³ sunt factae W² 18 De . . .
 sunt, *om.* E De Illyrico: India(e) Illiricum α Illiricum India W¹P³
 Histria P Liburni(a) Pα Delmatae B domitae W¹P³ ad, *om.* G
 19 caïam E sunt *ante* cum *add.* W² 20 et *ante* Moesis *add.* W² Mensis
 EP¹ Mensis W Moesiis W²P² ad, *om.* G 21 pedem *post* Romani
 r. W² pedom G 22 Pontis E Ponti WP¹P² eius, *om.* Eα occupat
 et E occupatum et α

Armenia minor, quam idem tenuerat, armis obtenta est, in Mesopotamiam Romanus peruenit exercitus, cum Parthis foedus initum est, contra Carduenos ac Saracenos et Arabas bellatum est, Iudaea omnis uicta est, Cilicia, Syriae in potestatem populi Romani peruenerunt, Aegypti reges foederati erant. 5 Sub imperatoribus uero per annos ccccvii, cum diuersa rei publicae fortuna multi principes imperarent, accesserunt Romano orbi Alpes Maritimae, Alpes Cottiae Raetiae Noricae Pannoniae Moesiae et omnis ora Danuuii in prouinciae est redacta. Pontus omnis, Armenia minor, Oriens totus cum 10 Mesopotamia, Assyria, Arabia et Aegypto sub imperii Romani iura transiuit.

IV. Quo ordine autem singulas prouincias Romana res publica adsecuta sit, infra ostenditur. Prima prouinciarum Sicilia facta est. Eam uicto Hierone, Siculorum rege, Marcellus 15 consul obtinuit. Deinde a praetoribus recta, postea est commissa praesidibus: nunc a consularibus administratur. Sardiniam et Corsicam Metellus uicit, triumphauit de Sardis (rebellauere saepe Sardi). Iuncta administratio harum insularum fuerat, post suos praetores habuit, nunc singulae a praesidibus 20 reguntur. In Africam pro defensione Siculorum Romana arma transmissa sunt. Ter Africa rebellauit; ad extremum, deleta per Africanum Scipionem Carthagine, prouincia facta est, nunc sub proconsulibus agit. Numidia ab amicis regibus tenebatur, sed
 1 quem EW (*manu rec. corr.* P¹) 3 Carduenos E Cardoneos WP¹W²
 Sacracenos B et: ad E Arabes E 4 et post Cilicia add. cf. Sria et
 Cilicia W¹ Syria BαW¹P³ 5 populo Romano E publice rei W¹
 6 annis B cccc P² 7 cum ante multi add. W² autem (tamen α) post
 accesserunt add. Eα 8 Romani WP¹W² Romanae P² orbi: urbi α
 Gothiae E Diane (*expunctis litteris*) post Cottiae add. P² 9 M(o)esia Eα
 prouinciam αW¹P³ redacta est W¹P³ 10 minor: codd., maior f 11
 Assyrii α Assyrii EBGW¹P³f Assariis P, cf. c. XIV et XX Arabiae EW
 Egiptii E Aegyptum W Egiptus P¹W²P² Aegyptus B 12 iure P²
 13 autem: utest E 14 sit: est α ostenditur ita infra α ostendetur
 W¹P³ 15 fracta E Sicilia post est tr. W² eam post rege tr. W²
 uicto, om. W¹ rege: regem E, om. W¹P³ 16 obtinuit, om. (*manu rec.*
additum est in margine) P est post recta add. W² commissa est W² 18
 Mitellinus E 19 rebellauere saepe Sardi, om. Eα administratione Eα
 harum: conso(u)larium que Eα 20 post: que EP¹ quae W et P²
 habuerat P² a, om. W¹P³f 21 geruntur G Affrica G pro: per Eα
 singulorum E 23 Cart(h)ago EαW¹P³ sub, om. G 24 consulibus E
 consularibus α Numidiam W regibus, om. Eα tenebantur B sed: sae B

Iugurthae, ob necatos Adherbalem et Hiempsalem, filios Micipsae regis, bellum indictum est; et eo per Metellum consulem adtrito, per Marium capto, in populi Romani potestatem Numidia peruenit. Mauritaniae a Boccho obtentae sunt. Sed
 5 subacta omni Africa Mauros Iuba rex tenebat, qui in causa belli ciuilis ab Augusto Caesare uictus mortem sibi propria uoluntate consciuit. Ita Mauritaniae nostrae esse coeperunt ac per omnem Africam sex prouinciae factae sunt: ipsa, ubi Carthago, est proconsularis, Numidia consularis, Byzacium
 10 consularis, Tripolis et duae Mauritaniae, hoc est Sitifensis et Caesariensis, sunt praesidales.

V. Hispanis primum auxilium aduersum Afros per Scipionem tulimus. Rebellantes Lusitanos in Hispania per Decimum Brutum obtinuimus et usque Gadis ad Oceanum mare peruenimus. Postea ad Hispanos tumultuantes Sylla missus eos uicit. Celtiberi in Hispania saepe rebellauere, sed misso iuniore Scipione cum excidio Numantiae subacti sunt. Omnes prope Hispaniae Sertoriani occasione belli per Metellum et Pompeium in dicionem acceptae sunt. Postea, prorogato quin-
 20 quennii imperio, a Pompeio perdomitae sunt. Ad extremum quoque ab Octauiano Caesare Augusto Cantabri et Astures,

1 Iurgatae E Aterbalem E Atrebalem WP¹ Atherbalem W² Athebalem P² 2 Mihipse E regibus G 3 adtributo β per Marium capto, om. β in, om. G 4 a, om. G 5 quia WP¹ in, om. P² 7 concivit P² ita mauit ubi (Mauritaniae... ipsa, om.) G ceperunt EW²P²P³ 8 sunt factae W² sunt: suae WP¹ ipsa et W² ipsaque P² 9 consularis (post Numidia): proconsularis W² Bizancium EW¹P³ Bizantia B 10 proconsularis W² Tripoli EWP¹P² duae: duo W Sitivensis α 11 pr(a)esidiales EαW¹P³ 12 Spaniis E Spanis WP¹W² aduersum: contra W² Afros: Vafros WP¹W² per Scipionem, om. W¹ 13 Spaniam EWP¹ Spania W² Decimum: cimum B 14 et: sed B Gades EP² 15 Spanos EWP¹W² tutumultantes B tumultuantes... uicit, om. Eα Sulla B Silanus f a Sylla missus exercitus conj. Jacobi, cf. Iord. Rom. 212 16 uicit: civit G evicit W¹P³ Celtiberos Eα qui ante in add. α Spania EP¹W² Spaniae W Spanis P² bellavere G rebellabant α sed, om. α iuniori G 17 prope: pene α 18 Spaniae EWP¹W² Sertoriani, om. WP¹W² belli occasione W¹ belli occasiae P³ 19 dictionem W deditionem P² nostram post dicionem add. Pf Postea... sunt, om. W¹ 20 ad: ab B 21 Cantabres E Cantabros WP¹W² Cantabrios W¹P³ Catachri G et, om. Eα Astores E Asturos W¹

qui freti montibus resistebant, deleti sunt. Ac per omnes Hispanias sex nunc sunt prouinciae: Tarraconensis, Carthaginensis, Lusitania, Gallaecia, Baetica, trans fretum etiam in solo terrae Africanae prouincia Hispaniarum est, quae Tingitana Mauretania cognominatur. Ex his Baetica et Lusitania consulares, ceterae sunt praesidiales.

5

VI. Cum Gallis grauissima bella populus Romanus habuit. Galli enim etiam eam partem Italiae, in qua nunc Mediolanum est, usque ad Rubiconem fluuium tenebant in tantum uiribus freti, ut Romam ipsam bello peterent, caesis exercitibus Romanis moenia urbis intrarent, Capitolium obsiderent, ad cuius arcem sescenti nobilissimi senatores confugerant; qui mille auri libris se ab obsidione redemerunt. Postea Gallos cum uictoria remeantes Camillus qui in exilio erat, collecta de agris multitudine oppressit; aurum et signa quae Galli ceperant, reportauit. Cum Gallis multi consules praetores ac dictatores euentu uario conflixerunt. Marius Gallos de Italia expulit, transcensis Alpibus feliciter aduersus eos pugnavit. C. Caesar cum decem legionibus, quae terna milia militum Itolorum

10

15

1 in ante montibus add. W² ut Romam (*verba expuncta*) ante montibus add. ex c. VI G resistebantur B ac: hec E Spanias EWP¹W² 2 nunc, om. α sunt hunc E prouintiae facte sunt de per omnes P² Terraconensis BWP¹W² Carthaginensis: Cartagin ensis (*littera erasa*) G Carthaginiensis PW¹P³Wf, om. P² 3 Lusitani E Callectia B Callectia P Calletia W¹P³ Betica codd. freta Eα in solo: solae GP³ insulae P insole W¹ insola W² 4 terra W² Affricana W² prouinciarum P² Spaniarum EWP¹W² est Hispaniarum P² est, om. GPf quae: qui WP¹ Tingitania Mauretania EWP¹P³ Tingimauretania BGPfw 5 cognominantur B Betica EPα Vetica G Boetica W¹P³ Lusitana W² consularum E sunt post consulares add. P³ 6 pr(a)esidiales EαW¹P³ praesides G 7 Cum: dum W¹ Gallis, om. E populo Romano G populi Romani W¹P³f habuit, om. W¹P³f 8 eam, om. B Mediolanus EWP¹P² 9 fluuium, om. P² 10 uiribus, om. Eα et post peterent add. EBαW¹P³ cecisis P³ ut ipsam post exercitibus add. W² 11 Romam W² apud Alliam fluvium post Romanis add. Eα urbis: utbis E obsederint B obsederent W (*manu rec. corr.* P¹) 12 sexcenti GWP¹W¹P³ dc W² de P² nobiles simul Eα nobiles senatores simul W² VI post qui manu coaeva? scriptum est G 13 milia GP MBW²fw ab, om. BW² redimerunt BWP¹P³ (*manu coaeva? supra corr.* G) 14 collecto G 15 multitudinem W coeperant BGP coepe W ceperunt W² 17 vario euentu W² euento vario EW (*manu rec. supra corr.* P¹) confinxerunt E Gallus B et post expulit add. αW¹ 18 transclusis W¹ C.: G. GP ceterum Eα, om. W¹P³ 19 qui (*manu coaeva? supra scriptum est*) quaterna G quaterna P quae quaterna W¹P³ militum, om. W²

- habuerunt, per annos viiii ab Alpibus ad Rhenum usque Gallias subegit, cum barbaris ultra Rhenum positis confluxit, in Britanniam transiuit, decimo anno Gallias et Britannias tributarias fecit. Sunt in Gallia Aquitania et Britanniis prouinciae
- 5 decem et octo: Alpes Maritimae, prouincia Viennensis, Narbonensis, Nouempopulana, Aquitaniae duae, Alpes Graiae, Maxima Sequanorum, Germaniae duae, Belgicae duae, Lugdunensis duae; in Brittania, Maxima Caesariensis, Flauia Caesariensis, Brittania prima, Brittania secunda.
- 10 VII. Illyricum ab ore maritimo paulatim adgressi sumus. Laeuius consul Hadriaticum atque Ionium mare primus ingressus maritimas obtinuit ciuitates. Creta per Metellum proconsulem, qui Creticus dictus est, prouincia facta est. Graecis in fidem nostram confugientibus ad Achaia accessimus.
- 15 Athenienses aduersum Philippum, Macedonum regem, auxilium nostrum petiuerunt. Libera diu sub amicitiiis nostris Achaia fuit, ad extremum legatis Romanorum apud Corinthum uiolatis per Lucium Mummius proconsulem capta Corintho Achaia omnis obtenta est. Epirotae, qui aliquando cum
- 20 Pyrrho rege etiam ad Italiam transire praesumpserant, uicti ac
- 1 annis E anno P viii (octo) Ea usque ante ad tr. W² usque: et W²
 2 Gallas W¹ Gallus P³ confluxit E 3 Britanniam EP³ Britanniam P²
 Britanniam W¹ x annos E decem annis α Gallia E Britannias W²P³
 Britannias W¹ 4 in, om. Ea Galliae Ea cum ante Aquitania add. Ea
 Britanniis E Britanniis P² pritanniis W¹ prittanniis P³ 5 maritima
 W²P² biennensis E bienensis WP² vienensis P¹ abianensis W² 6
 Nouempopulana: noviena populana P² Graiae: grage Ea Gaeae W¹P³
 7 duae (post Germaniae), om. Ea Belgae W Belice P¹ Belge W² Belgicae P²f Bellicae W¹P³ Belgicae duae, Lugdunensis duae, om. B Lugdunens (-es manu rec. supra scriptum est) P Lugdunenses P²W¹P³ 8 Britanniae E Britannia P²W¹P³ maxime E Flauia Caesariensis, om. Ea Floecia B 9 Caesariensis, Brittania prima, om. B prittania (ante prima) P Brittannia W¹ Britannia (ante secunda) P²P³ Brittannia W¹ 10 mauritimo W¹P³ 11 Libinus B Lebinus GW¹P³f Lebunus (prima littera u expuncta, littera i manu rec. supra scripta est) P Adriaticum EaW¹P³ Ionicum EWP¹W² 12 maritimas W¹ Creta: freta W¹ consulem E pro consule Bf 13 dictus, om. G Graecis, om. W¹ 14 confugientibus (littera erasa) W venientibus P² 15 Atenienses W (manu rec. corr. P¹) tenienses W² aduersus EaW¹P³ 16 petierunt Ea amicis E amicitia W² nostra W² 17 fuit Achaia W² ligatis E 18 uiolatus W Lucium, om. Ea consulem Ea procule (manu coeua? supra corr.) G Corint(h)us EWP¹W² 19 qui: que P² qui aliquando: qualiquando E 20 praesumpserunt GPP² ac: a EPα

Thessali simul cum Achiuorum et Macedonum regionibus nobis accesserunt. Macedonia ter rebellauit: sub Philippo, sub Perse, sub Pseudophilippo. Philippum Flamininus, Persen Paulus, Pseudophilippum Metellus oppressit, quorum triumphis Macedonia populo Romano adiuncta est. Illyrios, qui Macedonibus auxilium tulerunt, ex eadem occasione per Lucium An<i>cium praetorem uicimus et eos cum rege Gentio in deditionem accepimus. Dardanos et Moesios Curio pro consule subegit et primus Romanorum ducum ad Danuuium usque peruenit. Sub Iulio Octauiano Caesare Augusto per Alpes Iulias iter factum est, Alpinis omnibus uictis Noricorum prouinciae accesserunt. Bathone Pannoniarum rege subacto in dicionem nostram Pannoniae uenerunt. Amantinis inter Sauum et Drauum prostratis regio Sauiensis ac secundorum loca Pannoniarum obtenta sunt.

5

10

15

VIII. Marcomanni et Quadi de locis Valeriae, quae sunt inter Danuuium et Drauum, pulsati sunt et limes inter Romanos ac barbaros ab Augusta Vindelicum per Noricum, Pannonias

1 Thes(s)alis Eα Thesale G Thessaliae Pf Aciborum E Acivorum WP¹ (*manu coeua? supra corr.* G) Argivorum P² regionibus: regibus W¹P³ 2 terrae bellavit P Persas E 3 seodophilippo E (seu-P¹) Pseudophilippo (*finalis littera o expuncta, littera i manu coeua? supra scripta est*) G Philippum: filium (*litteris um expunctis, littera o et verbum philippum manu coeua? supra scripta sunt*) G Philippo W¹P³ Flamininus EP¹ Flamininus BW²P² Faminus W¹ Framinius P³ Persem B Perses P 4 seodophilippum E (seu-P¹) 5 populorum E iuncta G Illyricos BW¹P³ quia WP¹ Macedonum EW Macedonis P¹ 6 ex, om. P² occasionem W Lucium: Licium G, om. EWP¹W² Ancilium Eα Ancium BG Mancium P Mantuum W¹ Mantium P³ Anicium f 7 deditione E 8 accipimus P M(o)esiocos EP (M)oesiacos WP¹W²B β fw Mesios P² Moesios *scripsi secundum Iord. Rom. 216*, Dardanos Mysosque Curius α W¹P³ proconsul w et *codd. praeter* BG proconsules git G 10 sub . . . accesserunt, om. (*in margine add.*) W¹ et *post* Iulio *add.* P (*manu rec. supra scriptum est* P¹) Cesare (et *add.*) *post* Iulio tr. W² 11 alpinis: alpes B abpinus W¹P³ Novicorum E 12 cesserunt E Pannonie E Panniorum P (no *manu coeua? supra scriptum est* G) Paniorum P¹ dicio (-nem *manu coeua? supra scriptum est*) G Pannonie *post* subacto tr. W² 13 Amantinus EP¹ Suaevum E Suavum WP¹P² 14 Bravum W¹P³ Suaeensis E Suavensis WP¹ Savensis W² Suavis P² ac: de P² loc. *om.* (*manu rec. supra scriptum est*) P¹ 16 et, om. GW¹P³ Verlaeriae P variae W¹P³ Valeriae *post* sunt tr. P² 17 inter: in Eα 18 Augusto WP¹P² Augustis W¹P³ Vindelica W² Vendelicium W¹ per: et P² Noricos W² Pannonicas WP¹

- ac Moesiam est constitutus. Traianus Dacos sub rege Decibalo uicit et Daciam trans Danuuium in solo barbariae prouinciam fecit, quae in circuitu habuit deciens centena milia passuum; sed sub Gallieno imperatore amissa est et per Aurelianium,
 5 translatis exinde Romanis, duae Daciae in regionibus Moesiae ac Dardaniae factae sunt. Prouincias habet Illyricus XVIII: Noricorum duas, Pannoniarum duas, Valeriam, Sauiam, Dalmatiam, Moesiam <superiorem, Dardaniam>, Daciarum duas; et in dioecesi Macedonica prouinciae sunt septem:
 10 Macedonia, Thessalia, Achaia, Epiri duae, Praeualis, Creta.

- IX. In Thracias Macedonici belli occasione transcursum est. Saeuissimi omnium gentium Thraces fuerunt. In Thraciae regionibus etiam Scordisci habitauerunt, pariter crudeles et callidi. Multa de saeuitia praedictorum fabulosa memorantur,
 15 quod hostiis captiuorum diis suis aliquando litauerint, quod humanum sanguinem in ossibus capitum potare sint soliti. Saepe per eos Romanus est caesus exercitus. Marcus Didius uagantes Thracas repressit, Marcus Drusus intra fines proprios continuit, Minucius in Hebri fluminis glacie uastauit. Per
 20 Appium Claudium proconsulem hi qui Rhodopam incolebant

1 Mes(s)iam EαW¹P³ Decibalem W² 3 circuitum E habuit *post* passuum *tr.* P² decies *f et codd. praeter B, cf. c., XXVII* 4 imperatore: imperato (-re *manu rec. supra scriptum est*) P, *om.* P² 5 exinde: sex inde W² Mesiae EW¹P³ Mesia α 6 ac: ae P Dardania P² facta E Prouincias *post XVIII tr. Eα XVII Bα XVIII W¹P³* 7 Suaeviam E Suaviam α 8 superiorem, Dardaniam, *om. codd.; scripsi secundum Iord. Rom. 218* 9 dioecese Eα dioecesi BP diaecesi G diaecelis W¹P³ Macedonica: Machedoniae B Macedoniae α prouinciae, *om.* WP¹W² 10 Macedoniae WP¹ Macedonia . . . Praeualis, *om.* W¹P³ Achaiae G Epiri: Pari EWW² Putri P¹ Paron P² Piri G dua W² Privalis P² 11 Macedonie E Macedonice (*manu coeua? supra corr.*) G occasione *ante* Macedonici *tr.* W² una *ante* belli *add.* E transcursum est: transcurso mens E 12 Saeuissimi . . . fuerunt, *om.* P² Thraciae: Traciam E 13 etiam: sed iam E, *om.* α habitauerunt Eα crudeli E crudele α 14 callidi: gallidium E callidum α genus *ante multa add.* P¹ de quorum (*pro praedictorum*) sevitia multa fabulosa P² perdictorum E praedicatorum B 15 quod: que E qui α hostis E hostes α captivos diis suis *post* aliquando *tr.* W² litauerunt α quod: que E atque α 16 capitum: captiuorum P² portare Eα putare P sint: sunt W² 17 cesus ~~est~~ W¹W² exercitus cesus est P² 19 glac(t)iae EBWP¹P²β Galatie W² 20 Cladium (*manu rec. supra corr.*) P proconsulem: pro consule BPW¹P³, *om.* P²

uicti sunt. Europae maritimas urbes antea Romana classis
 obtinuit. Marcus Lucullus per Thracias cum Bessis primus con-
 fluxit. Ipsam caput gentis Thraciam uicit, Haemimontanos
 subegit, Eumolpiadam quae nunc Philippopolis dicitur, Uscu-
 damam quae modo Hadrianopolis uocatur, in dicionem 5
 nostram redegit, Cabylen cepit. Supra Pontum positas ciuitates
 occupauit: Apolloniam, Calathum, Parthenopolim, Tomos,
 Histrum; ad Danuuim usque perueniens Romana Scythis
 arma monstrauit. Ita dicioni rei publicae sex Thraciarum
 prouinciae sunt acquisitae: Thracia, Haemimontus, Moesia 10
 inferior, Scythia, Rhodopa, Europa, in qua nunc secundae
 arces Romani orbis sunt constitutae.

X. Nunc Eoas partes totumque Orientem ac positas sub
 uicino sole prouincias, qui auctores sceptris tuis parauerint,
 explicabo, quo studium clementiae tuae, quod in isdem pro- 15
 pagandis habes, amplius incitetur. Asia societate Attali regis
 nota Romanis est eamque Attali testamento relictam here-
 ditario iure possedimus. Ne quid tamen populus Romanus non
 uiribus partum haberet, armis per nos ab Antiocho, Syriarum

1 Europe E classis: clausis (*manu coeua? supra corr.*) G 3 ipsa W¹ et
 mimontanos E eminontanos WP¹W² 4 Ceumolpiada W¹P³ Uscu-
 daman EWP² Usquedaman P¹ Uscudanam W² 5 Arrianopolis E
 Adria(o)nopolis αW¹ uocatur: nominatur EαW¹P³f, om. GP, cf. *Iord. Rom.*
 221 6 Cavillam Eα Capylen β coepit BPWP³ caepit GP² 7
 Galatum EWW² Galatiam P¹ Galatiam P² Tomos: Tosoos E Tomas
 G 8 istrum Eα Historum P is ante Romana add. W² arma Scitis
 W² Scitur E iscitis WP² 9 ita: in Eα dicionem Eα ditione W¹
 dictioni P³ rei publicae: p. r. P² publicae: pubus W 10 provincie
 Traciarum W² conquisit(a)e Eα Thracia Haemimontus: Traciemi
 Pontus Eα Tracia Hemipontus W¹P³ Thraciae Hemimontus B
 Moesia bis G 11 Scita E Scidia P Rhodoma B Europa, om. W¹P³
 12 Romanae W² orbis: urbis PWP¹W² constituti G constitutu P Con-
 stantinopolis post constitutae add. EWP¹W²W¹P³ 13 Eoas: eo has W
 eas P² partis E posita E 14 viciano G parauerunt EWP¹W² paru-
 verint P² 15 quo: qui E studio E quod: que E quo W² 16
 ht ante habes add. W¹ habes: abeas E habeas α habens B excitetur Eα
 Attali regis nota Romanis est eamque bis W¹P³ Attalis GP Itali W²
 17 est, om. EWP¹W² eaque WP¹W² Attali: Itali W² hereditario relictā
 W² 18 iure: re E possidemus GW² posedamus P¹ populus: popu-
 larem E popolare α Romanus, om. Eα 19 uiribus: iuribus E uiris α
 partium Eα parthum W¹P³ armis post maximo tr. P² Anticho (*manu
 coeua? supra corr.*) G

rege maximo, est uindicata. Eadem occasione etiam Lydia, sedes antiqua regnorum, Caria, Hellespontus ac Phrygiae in potestatem populi Romani iuncta ditione uenerunt. Rhodiis et insularum populis experti primum infestissimis sumus, post
 5 isdem fidelissimis auxiliatoribus utebamus. Ita Rhodus et insulae primum libere agebant, postea in consuetudinem parendi Romanis clementer prouocantibus peruenerunt et sub Vespasiano principe Insularum prouincia facta est.

XI. Pamphyliam, Lyciam, Pisidiam Seruilius pro consule ad
 10 bellum piratarum missus obtinuit. Bithyniam Nicomedis defuncti regis testamento sumus adsecuti. Gallograeciam, hoc est Galatiam (sunt etenim, ut nomen resonat, ex Gallis Galatae), quod Antiocho contra Romanos auxilium praeuissent, inuasimus. Mummius pro consule Galatas persecutus est et con-
 15 fugientes partim in Olympum, partim in Magabam montem, qui nunc Modiacus dicitur, de arduis eos in plana detruxit, uictos in perpetuam pacem redegit. Postea Galatiam Deiotarus tetrarches, nobis permittentibus, tenuit. Ad extremum sub Octauiano Caesare Augusto Galatia in speciem prouinciae

1 etiam occasione P² 2 Cariae E Lespontus E et lespontus W
 ellespontus P¹ et elespontus W² ac: a P frigie EP² frigidiae W frig-
 ulae P¹ frigidia W² Frygiae P, cf. *Iord. Rom. c. 222*, utrasque frigias
 3 ditione W¹P²P³ Rodis EWP¹W² Rhodus BPP²W¹P³ 4 expertis
 EP¹ primus WP¹W² infestissimis BP infectissimis (*litterae -ssimis
 expunctis*) G infestissimus W infestissimi P² infestissimis . . . isdem, om.
 W¹P³ sumus . . . fidelissimis, om. WP¹W² post: pro E porti B positi P
 5 hoc ante isdem add. P² eisdem B iisdem (*littera h manu coeua? supra
 scripta est*) G istem P fidelissimos P² auxiliatorum α utebamus. Ita: ut
 ae barita E ut ebarita W uteban ita P¹ utebar ita W² utabamur (ita,
 om.) P² utebatur ita B Rhodiis W¹ et, om. W¹P³ 6 libera E ge-
 bant E in . . . Romanis, om. β consuetudine EWP¹W² parendi: pacis P²
 7 dementer W² provocatis α 8 principe, om. W¹ 9 Lyciam: Frig-
 iam Eα psidiam WP¹W² persidam W¹P³ proconsul Eαw 10 piri-
 tarum E Bithiam WP¹W² et ante Nicomedis add. E 10 regis defuncti
 W² 12 Galletiam P¹ etenim: enim E Galatis W² Galathe P²
 13 quod: quaedum α Anticho P¹ pr(a)ebuisset EWP¹ 14 Mummius:
codd., Manlius f proconsul EαW¹P³ confugientem E 15 partim,
 (post confugientes) om. E partem E parti W² Magabiam Eα 16
 destruxit B detruxit P¹ 17 redigit BP¹ Galam (*manu rec. supra corr.*) P
 Deiotaros E 18 tetrarc hes: et t(h)races Eα tetrarches B tethaces
 W¹P³ promittentibus EW annuentibus W² ad: ab B 19 Galaciam
 GP speciem, om. W² prouinciam W²

redacta est et eam primus Lollius pro praetore administravit. Cappadoces primum societatem nostram sub Apafrace rege petiuerunt posteaque Ariobarzanes rex Cappadocum, a Mithridate expulsus, Romanorum armis est restitutus. Semper inter auxilia nostra fuere Cappadoces et ita maiestatem coluere Romanam, ut in honorem Augusti Caesaris Mazaca, ciuitas Cappadociae maxima, Caesarea cognominaretur. Postremo sub imperatore Claudio Caesare cum Archelaus rex Cappadocum Romam uenisset et ibi diu detentus occubisset, in prouinciae speciem Cappadocia migravit. Pontus, per Pompeium uicto Mithridate rege Pontico, formam prouinciae accepit. Paphlagoniam Pylaemenes rex, amicus populi Romani, tenuit. Saepe ex ea pulsus regno a nobis est restitutus, quo mortuo prouinciae ius Paphlagonibus inpositum est.

XII. Ultra iuga Tauri montis quemadmodum possessio Romana perrexit, consequenti locorum magis quam temporum seruata digestionem monstrabitur. Antiochus, Syriae potentissimus rex, bellum formidabile populo Romano intulit. Trecenta milia armatorum habuit, falcatis etiam curribus et elephantis

1 et, *om.* E α primum E α 2 primi EB β primo α f, primum *scripsi*, *cf.* *Iord. Rom.* 225 sub, *om.* P² Afracere E Africae W Africe P¹P² Afice W² Epafrace β , *cf.* *Iord. Rom.* 225, Epafra rege: re E α 3 petierunt E α Aroba(r)zanes EWP¹W² a Mithridate, *om.* P² mithrida W¹P³ 4 est, *om.* EWP¹W² restitutus est P² inter: in α 5 auxilio (*manu rec. supra corr.*) P¹ fuere: fecere W¹P³ magestatem P hoc ante coluere *add.* E 6 in, *om.* E Magapa E civitates G civitatis W 7 maxima Capadocie W² cognominaretur: nuncuparetur E α postremum EWP¹W² 8 cum ante sub *add.* E α imperato (*manu rec. supra corr.*) P Claudio: *codd.*, *cf.* *Iord. Rom. c.* 225 cum, *om.* P² Archelaus rex Cappadocum, *om.* B rex: ex WP¹W² Cappadocie E Cap(p)adocia WP¹W² 9 et ibi: ibique α et, *om.* E detentus: temtus EP¹ tentus W manens W² 10 Pontus: Pompeus W¹P³ Ponticor E pontifico G 12 Paglagoniam E Paflagoniam BGP α a Flagoniam W¹P³ Filimenses E Philimen(s)es α Pylemens B 13 regno: rego (*manu coeua? supra corr.*) G, *om.* P² est, *om.* P restituit P 14 ius: nom P² Flagonibus EWP¹W² Palagonibus B Paflagonibus β P² positum W² 15 montes W quo modo P² Romana possessio P² 16 per rexit P² magisque EP¹P² 17 serva B potentissimus E 18 formidabile bellum W² fordabile populi Romani (*manu coeua? supra corr.*) G trecenta: cccc E XL WP¹W² infinitam P² 19 milia: multitudinem P² habuit: habens P² elephantis EB α

aciem instruxit; a Scipione consule, fratre Scipionis Africani, in Asia apud Magnesiam uictus, pace accepta, intra Taurum regnare permissus est. Eius filii regnum Syriae sub clientela populi Romani retinuerunt; quibus defunctis Syriarum prouinciis potiti sumus. Cilices et Isauros, qui se piratis ac praedonibus maritimis iunxerant, Seruilius pro consule ad praedonum bellum missus subegit et uiam per Taurum montem primus instituit; isque de Cilicibus et Isauris triumphauit atque Isauricus est cognominatus.

- 10 XIII. Cyprus, famosa diuitiis, paupertatem populi Romani, ut occuparetur, sollicitauit. Eam rex foederatus regebat, sed tanta fuit penuria aerarii et tam ingens opum fama Cypriarum, ut lege data Cyprus confiscari iuberetur. Quo accepto rex Cyprius nuntio uenenum sumpsit, ut uitam prius quam diuitias amitteret. Cato Cyprias opes Romam nauibus aduexit. Ita ius eius insulae auarius magis quam iustius sumus adsecuti. Cyrenas cum ceteris ciuitatibus Libyae Pentapolis Ptolomaei Antiquioris liberalitate suscepimus. Libyam supremo Appionis regis arbitrio sumus adsecuti. Aegyptus omnis sub amicis regibus fuerat, sed uicta cum Antonio Cleopatra prouinciae formam Octauiani Caesaris Augusti temporibus accepit: et primum apud Alexandrinos Cornelius Gallus Romanus iudex administrauit.

- 25 XIV. Per confinia Armeniarum primum sub Lucio Lucullo Romana trans Taurum arma transmissa sunt. Phylarchi Sarcenorum in Osrhoena cessere superati. In Mesopotamia ab
 1 a: ab WP¹ Spicionis E consule fratre Scipionis, om. Eα Africano α
 2 Taurum: aurum (*manu coaeva? supra corr.*) G 3 est, om. P³ eius, om. G
 Syriae, om. Eα clientena P² clientala W¹P³ 4 populis P retenue-
 runt G provincias EW 6 proconsul *codd. praeter* BGP 7 missus,
 om. (*in margine add.*) W² montem, om. (*in margine add.*) W² Cilibus EP
 8 isque . . . triumphauit, om. (*in margine add.*) P³ itaque βfw 12 tantae
 GW¹P³ Romani *post aerarii add.* α et tam: etiam B et tamen G 13
 Cipris EWP¹P² confiscare Eα confixari W¹P³ iuberet EαW¹P³ 14
 ut: qui E quo α 15 Romani W¹ auexit α 16 ita: haut E ut
ante ius add. WP¹P² ius: universae W² opes *ante avarius add.* W² iustis
 EP² iustus W¹P³ sumus: simus EWP², om. B 17 Cirenam P¹ 18
 Antiquiores GP supermo EP³ 19 ab *post sub add.* E 20 fomam B
 21 et: ut E 22 Alexandriam W² 23 primus E Licio W² L. P²
 24 arma *ante trans tr.* W² Fularchi EWP¹P² Fylarchi BβW², cf. *Iord.*
Rom. 230, Filarchi 25 Oydroena Eα Osybenates P cessere: sere P
 Caes(s)are WP¹ Caesarea P² superat GP Mesopotamiam EW

eodem Lucullo Nisibis capta est. Postea per Pompeium eadem
 loca armis obtenta sunt. Syriae et Phoenice bello a Tigra-
 ne, Armeniorum rege, receptae sunt. Arabes et Iudaei in Palaestina
 uicti sunt. Ad extremum sub Traiano principe regi maioris
 Armeniae diadema sublatum est et per Traianum Armenia, 5
 Mesopotamia, Assyria et Arabia prouinciae factae sunt ac
 limes Orientalis supra ripas Tigridis est institutus. Sed Hadri-
 anus qui successit Traiano, inuidens Traiani gloriae, sponte sua
 Armeniam, Mesopotamiam, Assyriam reddidit ac medium
 inter Persas et Romanos Euphraten esse uoluit. Sed post sub 10
 Antoninis duobus, Marco et Vero, ac Seuero Pertinaci ceter-
 isque principibus Romanis, qui aduersum Parthos euentu
 uario dimicarunt, quater amissa, quater recepta Mesopotamia
 est; ac Diocletiani temporibus, uictis prima congressione
 Romanis, secundo autem conflictu superato rege Narseo, uxore 15
 eius ac filiabus captis et cum summa pudicitiae custodia re-
 seruatis, pace facta Mesopotamia est restituta et supra ripas
 Tigridis limes est reformatus, ita ut quinque gentium trans
 Tigridem constitutarum dicionem adsequeremur. Quae
 1 Nisibi EWP¹P² postea: propterea WP¹W² 2 optensa W¹P³ Syria
 BW^{2w} et: a EWP¹, om. GW¹P³P²W² Fenicae E Fanicae WP¹ Fenice
 W² Fenicie P² Foenici B Foenix GP³ Faenix W¹ 3 Armeniarum
 E ceptae B recepta W² Palestinam E Palestrina W¹P³ 4 regis
 Eα regis post Armenie tr. W² 5 per Traianum post Arabia tr. W²
 Armeniam EW 6 Mesopotamiam EWP¹P² Si(y)riae EWP¹P²W¹P³
 Syria W² Assi(y)riae GP Arabiae EBW sunt factae W² 7 limes:
 miles α orientales EW (manu rec. supra corr. P¹) super W² ripa E ripam
 α W¹P³ fluminis ante (post W²) Tigridis add. EαW¹P³ institus (manu rec.
 supra corr.) P¹ Atrianus E Adrianus αW¹P³ 8 gloriam EWP¹ sua,
 om. P² 9 Armeniam Asiam Mesopotamiam EWP¹P²W¹P³ Assyriam,
 om. W² 10 Romanis E Eufraten f et codd. praeter P postea EP²
 propterea WP¹W² 11 Antoniis αW¹P³ duobus Antoniis W² et, om.
 W² ac: et WW² 12 Romanis principibus W² aduersus EWP¹P²
 contra aduersas W² Partos EWP¹ partes W² 12/13 vario eventū W²
 13 dimicauerunt EWP¹W² quae post dimicarunt add. GP quater (ante
 amissa): quantum Eα quater recepta, om. B quater (ante recepta): quan-
 tum EWP¹W² tantum P² quae P 14 ac . . . Mesopotamia est, om.
 (in margine add.) P³ ac: a B Dioclitiani EP¹W² 15 Rumani B se-
 cunda E conflictus EG conflictu B suprato B Narsen Eα 16
 capitis B cum: secum E, om. P¹ pudicitia W² custodia, om. W² servatis
 W² 17 super WP¹W² ripa E ripam α 18 reformatus: confirma-
 tus Eα refirmatus f ut quinque bis E 19 Tigridi EWW² Tigridim
 P² constitutarum B

condicio foederis in tempus diualis Constantii reseruata durauit.

XV. Scio nunc, inclyte princeps, quo tua pergat intentio. Requiris profecto, quotiens Babyloniae ac Romanorum arma
 5 conlata sint et quibus uicibus sagittis pila contenderint. Breuiter euentus enumerabo bellorum. Furto hostes in paucis inuenies esse laetatos, uera autem uirtute semper Romanos probabis exstitisse uictores. Primum a Lucio Sylla pro consule Arsaces, rex Parthorum, missa legatione amicitias populi
 10 Romani rogauit ac meruit. Lucius Lucullus Mithridaten, regno Ponti exutum, ad Armeniam persecutus est. Tigranen, Armeniorum regem, cum septem milibus clibanariis et centum uiginti sagittariorum, ipse cum decem et octo Romanorum milibus uicit. Tigranocertam, maximam Armeniae ciuitatem,
 15 expugnauit. Madaenam, optimam Armeniorum regionem, obtinuit, per Melitenam ad Mesopotamiam descendit, Nisibin cum fratre regis cepit. Tendere in Persas paratus successorem accepit.

XVI. Cn. Pompeius expertae felicitatis ad Mithridaticum
 20 bellum missus Mithridaten in Armenia minore, nocturno

1 Constantii diualis W² Constant P² Constaneii W¹ conservata βf
 3 inclite EPαW¹ inclytae B quo: qua E 4 requires βf Babyloniae β
 Bibiloniae E Babyloniis W² ac, om. α 5 sint: sunt W² et: sub W²
 uicibus, om. G pila et sagittis W² contenderunt E 6 euntes WP¹W²
 enumerabo euntes W² bellatorum E furtu E forte B hostes P¹ 7
 uera: verum Eα autem: aut E uirtute, om. Eα 8 Lucio, om. E pro
 consule, om. P² 9 Arices E legatione: largatione G 10 Lucius:
 Lucillius E L. P, om. α Lucullus: Lucillus P Mit(h)ridatem EαW¹P³
 Mithrithaten P 11 Tigranem EW²P² Trigranem W Triganem P¹
 Tygaanen G 12 Armeniarum E militibus G glibanariis B cliban-
 ariis . . . uiginti, om. GP et cxx EP²W²W¹P³ 13 milibus post uiginti
 add B cum, om. PW¹P³ milibus Romanorum W² 14 militibus G
 Tigrano cretam EW²P²W¹P³ Trigranocretam WP¹ Tigranocircam B
 Tigranochirtam GP Armeniam WP¹ 15 Adaanam E Adenam α
 Madaenan B Mademam W¹P³ regionem: regem E regionum P¹ 16
 Meleten Eα iuelitenam B melitemam W¹P³ ascendit E descendit GW
 17 eius post fratre add. P fratrem E regis: regit W coepit BW caepit
 P² in Persas, om. WP¹W² paratum E 18 suscepit P 19 Cn: cum
 non E Gn. BGP N̄ W¹P³, om. WP¹W² in ante expertae add. P² exper-
 tam E exparte β W² Mitridatim cum B 20 Mitridatem α W¹ (manu
 rec. corr. P³) minore noctu EWP¹W²

adgressus proelio superavit, caesis duobus et quadraginta milibus hostium castra eius inuasit. Mithridates cum uxore et duobus comitibus in Bosphoron fugit, ibi desperatione rerum suarum uenenum hausit et cum uis ueneni parum ageret, a milite suo, ut ferro percuteretur, impetrauit. Pompeius auxiliatorem Mithridatis Tigranen, Armeniorum regem, persecutus est: ille ei se oblato diademate apud Artaxata dedit. Receptae ab eo sunt Mesopotamia, Syriae et aliquanta pars Phoenices; atque intra Armeniam maiorem regnare permissus est. Idem Pompeius Bosphorianis et Colchis Aristarchum regem inposuit, cum Albanis conflixit, Orhodi, Albanorum regi, ter uicto pacem dedit, Hiberiam cum Artace rege in deditionem accepit, Saracenos et Arabas uicit. Iudaea capta Hierosolymam obtinuit, cum Persis foedus icit. Rediens apud Antiochiam Daphnensem lucum, delectatus loci amoenitate et aquarum abundantia, addito nemore consecrauit.

XVII. Marcus Crassus consul aduersum rebellantes Parthos missus est. Is cum pacem missa a Persis legatione rogaretur, apud Ctesiphonta responsurum se ait. Apud Zeugmam traiecit

2 eius inuasit castra W² Mitridatus WP¹ duos (s expuncta) P 3 Bosforos EB Bosphoros f fugiit EW 4 hausit: auxit E uis: ius W² parum: patrum P¹ ageret, a: acerta E est et acer WP¹W² cet aceta P² 5 ut ferro percuteretur ante milite tr. W² militi W²P² ferrum (litteris um expunctis, littera o manu coeua? supra scripta est G) P imperavit EP¹W²P² auxiliatorem Mithridatis, om. P² ausiliatorem E auxiliarem W auxiliare (litteris ar expunctis, litterae to manu rec. supra scriptae sunt) P¹ 6 Trigane E Tigranem BαW¹P³ 7 ille se EP² ei post diademate (post Artaxata W²) tr. WP¹ Artaxatam B reddidit Eα dedit B 8 accepte P² 9 Fenicis Eα Foenices BP Phoenices (secunda littera e expuncta, littera i manu coeua? supra scripta est) G Faenicis W¹ Phoenicis P³ 10 Bosforianis EBGα Bosforianus P Bosforinis W¹P³ Bosphorianis f Colchis: collegis Eα 11 Albanis . . . Orhodi, om. B conflixit E Orode EWP¹P² Oro W² Orhode βf 12 rege Eα Artaco W² 13 Arabes BW Arabos P Iudeam EWW²W¹ captam WW² 14 Iherosolima EW¹P³ foedus: pacem W² iecit EB eiecit GP fecit αW¹P³w icit f 15 Dafnensem EBPα Dapfnensem GP³ Dapfnonsem W¹ locum B amenitatem E 16 addeto E additio B 17 Marcus: M. BP², om. W¹P³ aduersus Eα Parthos rebellantes W² 18 missum EBG pacemis apersis E pace WP¹ Persas (manu coeua? supra corr.) G missa a Persis legatione post rogaretur tr. W² 19 Tasefontem E Thesifontem α Ctesifanta B Ctesifonta GPP³ fonta W¹ se: est EWP¹W² esse P² ait ante apud tr. W² Zeum(n)am EBα Zeugnam G Zeugma f

- Euphraten et a transfuga quodam Mazzaro inductus ad ignotam camporum solitudinem descendit. Ibi undique circumvolantibus sagittariorum agminibus cum Silate et Surena praefectis regis est cinctus exercitus et ui telorum obrutus. Ipse
- 5 Crassus cum ad conloquium sollicitatus uiuus paene capi posset, repugnantibus tribunis euaserat et fugam petens occisus est. Caput eius cum dextera manu resectum ad regem perlatum est atque ita ludibrio habitum, ut faucibus eius aurum liquefactum infunderetur: scilicet ut qui ardens cupiditate praedandi
- 10 pacem regi dare rogatus abnuerat, etiam mortui eius reliquias auri flamma conbureret. Lucius Cassius, quaestor Crassi, uir strenuus, reliquias fusi collegit exercitus. Contra Persas in Syriam inrumpentes ter cum summa admiratione conflixit eosque trans Euphraten reiectos uastauit.
- 15 XVIII. Parthi Labieno qui Pompeianarum partium fuerat ac uictus ad Persas refugerat, duce in Syriam inruperunt ac totam prouinciam occuparunt. P. Ventidius Bassus Parthos, qui ducente Labieno Syriam inuaserant, occurens in Capro monte cum paucis fugauit, Labienum occidit, persecutus Persas

1 Euphraten Eαβ et, om. EWP¹P² a, om. P¹ quodam transfuga W² quodam E Mazoro Eα nomen ante inductus add. W² 2 cum volantibus GP 3 Surena: supinate Eα regis praefectis W² 4 regis P² regius W¹ cinctis (manu rec.? supra corr.) B cunctus W¹ ui telorum: vii telorum E iaculorum W² obrutus: ictibus W² quo post ipse add. W² 5 ad, om. GP conloquium: alloquio W¹P³ sollicitus W¹P³ uiuus, om. Eα capi pene W² 6 dum ante fugam add. α peti(i)t α 7 caput: apud B manu dextra W² dextra α resectum: reffectum W relatum P², om. W¹ 8 liquefactum aurum P² 9 ut, om. αβf quia EB cupiditate ardens W² 10 dare regi W² rogatur W adnuerat E morti EWP¹ mortuo W¹P³ reliquias eius auri W² 11 auri, om. P² Lucius: L. BGP, om. W¹ Gaius f Cassius: Carsius E quaesto B Cassi E 12 colligit WP¹ in, om. W² 13 tergum suum WP¹W² administratione βf conflixit E 14 Euphraten Eαβ reiectos: traiectosuo E traiectos α eiectos GW¹P³ 15 Lavieno Bβ duce Lavieno W¹P³ Labieno duce α Pompeianarum P¹ Pompenanarum W¹ 16 fugerat Eα confugerat B duce, om. β WP¹W² 17 occupauerunt P² P.: Publius Eα, om. W¹ (in margine add. W²) Vendius (litterae di supra scriptae sunt) W Vendidius P¹W² Bassos E (manu rec. supra corr. P) 18 duce W¹P³ Libiaeno E Lavi- eno Bβ invaserunt EWP¹P² Capro: codd., Tauro fw 19 Lavienum Bβ Persas persecutus est et W² est post persecutus add. EαW¹P³ et post Persas add. Eα

ad internicionem strauit. Qua congressione Pacorum regis
 filium eadem die, qua Crassus fuerat uictus, occidit, ne
 aliquando Romani ducis mors inulta relinqueretur. Ventidius
 de Persis primus triumphauit. M. Antonius Mediam ingressus,
 quae nunc Madaena appellatur, bellum Parthis intulit, et 5
 primis eos proeliis uicit. Post duabus legionibus amissis, cum
 fame, pestilentia, tempestatibus premeretur, uix per Armeniam,
 Persis insequentibus, reuocauit exercitum, tanto per momenta
 temporis terrore percussus, ut a gladiatore suo percuti postu-
 laret, ne uiuus ueniret in hostium potestatem. 10

XIX. Sub Octauiano Caesare Augusto Armenia cum Par-
 this conspirauit. Claudius Caesar, nepos Augusti, cum exercitu
 missus ad Orientem, cum pro maiestate Romani nominis facile
 cuncta sedasset atque ei se Armenii, qui tunc temporis uali-
 diores erant, cum Parthis dedissent iudicesque ex instituto 15
 Pompei praedictis gentibus Claudius Caesar praeficeret:
 Donnes quidam, quem Parthis Arsaces praeposuerat, proditi-
 one simulata, libellum, in quo conscripti thesauri conti-
 nerentur, obtulit. Quem cum imperator Romanus legeret
 intentius, cultro Claudium adgressus uulnerauit. Percussor 20

1 internicionem βW^2 quia P^1 paucorum E pastorum WW^2P^2 (*cp.*
deteriores codd. Eutropii 7.5.2), parum B paucorum G pacurum P poucu-
 rum W^1P^3 pacorum P^1 , *cf. Iord. Rom. 237* 2 qua: que E victus e W^2
 occisit W 2/3 ne . . . relinqueretur, *om. P^2* 3 in ultra W^1 reli-
 queretur GP Vendidius WP^1W^2 4 primus: prius E, *om. β M.:*
 Marcus $E\alpha$ Antoninus W^1 5 Medena $EP^2W^2W^1P^3$ Moedena W
 Medana P^1 Madena Gw 6 primus E post: per E verum αW^1P^3
 7 pestilenta B et *post* pestilentia *add. W^2* praemerentus (*littera n expuncta*
manu rec.) P 8 tantum W^1P^3 terrore per momentum temporis W^2
 momento E 9 temporum WP^1P^2 perclusis E percussus WP^1P^2 a,
om. EWP^1W^2 gladiatorem suum W^2 se *post* suo *add. P^2W^2W^1P^3* per-
 secuti β postularetur EW 10 in hostium veniret P^2 11/12
 Parthis . . . Augusti, *om. P^2* 12 conspiratum W^2 Claudius: *codd., cf.*
Iord. Rom. c. 240 Gaius f nepus WP^1 Augustini P^1 exercitum B
 13 oriente E pro: per $E\alpha$ maiestatem α cum (*litteris expunctis*) ante facile
add. W^2 14 cunti E cunta P^1 ei se: eis W^2 qui: quo E validio-
 rum E 15 erant, *om. (in margine add.) W^2* partes WP^1W^2 deditis-
 sent P iudices qui EWP^1W^2 ex, *om. E $\beta\alpha$* 16 Pompeio E Claudius:
codd., Gaius f 17 Donnes: de omnes E de omnibus αW^1P^3 quem:
 qui E que P^2 Arsacis $B\beta W^2f$ 18 libelli EWP^1W^2 scripti $E\alpha$
 continentur E continebantur W^2P^2 19 quem: que P^1 Romanus
 imperator W^2 20 ultro $E\alpha$ Claudium: gladio α Gaium f percussus E

- quidem a militibus confossus est. Claudius ex uulnere, regressus
in Syriam, obiit. Persae ad satisfactionem tam audacis admissi
obsides tunc primum Octauiano Caesari Augusto dederunt
et erepta sub Crasso signa rettulerunt. Pacatis gentibus
5 Orientis, Augustus Caesar etiam Indorum legationem primus
accepit.

- XX. Nero, quem turpissimum imperatorem Romana est
passa res publica, amisit Armeniam. Duae tunc Romanae
legiones sub iugum a Persis missae extremo dedecore Romani
10 exercitus sacramenta foedarunt. Traianus, qui post Augustum
Romanae rei publicae mouit lacertos, Armeniam recepit a
Parthis, sublato diademate Armeniae maioris regnum ademit.
Albanis regem dedit, Hiberos, Bosporianos, Colchos in fidem
Romanae dicionis recepit, Osroenorum loca et Arabum occu-
15 puit, Carduenos, Marcomedos obtinuit, Anthemusium, opti-
mam Persidis regionem, Seleuciam, Ctesiphontem, Baby-
loniam accepit ac tenuit, usque ad Indiae fines post Alexandrum
accessit. In mari rubro classem instituit. Prouincias fecit
Armeniam, Mesopotamiam, Assyriam, quae inter Tigridem
20 atque Euphraten sita inriguis amnibus instar Aegypti fecunda-
tur. Hadrianum gloriae Traiani certum est inuidisse. Qui ei

1 confossus: confusus (*littera o manu coeua? supra scripta est*) G confessus
WP¹ confixussus W¹ confixus P³ est, *om.* P¹ Claudius: *codd.*, Gaius f
ex, *om.* Eα in Syriam reversus vulnere P² reversus Eα 2 Syriam:
Samarium E audaces EWW² facti *post* audacis *add.* P² 3 tun W¹P³
primo α Caesari: Caesare P, *om.* P² 4 et erepta, *om.* W¹ pagatis W
5 Cesar Augustus W² legatione P¹ primum Eα 6 accepit: audivit
W² 7 Romane P Romani WP¹ Romana res publica passa est im-
perem W² rei \bar{p} *post* Romana *tr.* B 8 Armeniae E Armenias duas
(duas Armenias W²) α 9 legiones: religiones E sub iugum, *om.* Eα
ad Persas α missas WP¹P² 10 foederant G foederarunt W¹P³
11 lacertos movit P² 11/12 Armeniam . . . diademate, *om.* WP¹W²
12 partes E maioris Armenie W² Armenia E 13 regem: regionem
W¹ Bosporianos E Bosporianos BGPα Bosporanos W¹P³ Bosporianos f
Colchos Eα fide P 14 recepit: receptos B Osroenorum E Oser-
enorum α Rhenorum B loca et Arabum *om.* WP¹W² 15 Marcum-
edos E Marcomannos W² Anthemusium Eβ WP¹f in themusium B
16 civiter (*litteris expunctis*) *post* Persidis *add.* W² Seleuciam et EWP¹P²
Seleuciamque BGF Thesiphontem Eα Ctesiphontem Bβ et *ante* Babyloniam
add. α 17 *post*: propter W² 18 mare BG rubrum B classem . . .
fecit, *om.* B 19 Mesopotamiam Armeniam W² Tigridem G 20
atque: et W² Euphraten EαW¹P³ sita inriguis (*verba expuncta*) medium G
inriguus E fecundantur W² 21 Adrianus Eα Adrianum W¹P³
traioni P¹

successor in imperio sponte propria reuocatis exercitibus Armeniam, Mesopotamiam, Assyriam concessit et inter Romanos ac Persas Euphraten medium esse uoluit.

XXI. Antonini duo, Marcus et Verus, hoc est socer et gener, pariter Augusti, imperium orbis aequata primum potestate tenuerunt. Sed ex his Antoninus iunior ad expeditionem Parthicam profectus est; multa et ingentia aduersus Persas feliciter gessit; Seleuciam, Assyriae urbem, cum quadringentis milibus hostium cepit; ingenti gloria de Persis cum socero triumphauit. Seuerus, natione Afer, acerrimus imperator, Parthos strenue uicit, Aziabenos deleuit, Arabas interiores obtinuit et in Arabia prouinciam fecit. Huic cognomina ex uictoriis quaesita sunt; nam Aziabenicus, Parthicus, Arabicus est cognominatus. Antoninus, cognomento Caracalla, filius Seueri imperatoris, expeditionem in Persas parans, in Osrhoena apud Edessam propria morte obiit et ibidem sepultus est.

XXII. Aurelius Alexander quasi fato quodam in exitium Persicae gentis renatus iuuenis admodum Romani gubernacula suscepit imperii. Persarum regem nobilissimum Xersem gloriose uicit. Hic Alexander scriniorum magistrum habuit Ulpianum

1 successit W² in, om. Eα propria sponte W² reuocatis: in reductis Eα
2 concessit: dimisit W² 3 Euphraten EPαW¹P³ uoluit esse E 4
Antonii W² Verus: Nerus WP¹ est: ex P 5 imperum P aequata:
equa W² 6 Antonius W¹W² expeieionem P¹ 7 mira ante feliciter
add. W² felicitate EWP¹W² 8 urbem: orbem E quadragentis G
quadrantis W 9 hostius W¹ coepit BG caepit W gloriam W de:
ad W² triumphauit cum socero W² triumphauit E 11 Aziabenos
deleuit, om. GP adiabenos EP¹W²f atiabenos W adiebenos P² at dia-
benos W¹P³ interiores, om. Eα et, om. W² in, om. Eα W¹P³ Arabiam
codd. praeter B 12 hinc W² victoria E 13 nam: inam E sunt
Part(h)icus enim et Arabicus et Adie(a, ae)benicus est α Azabenicus E
Adiebenicus WP¹W¹ Adiabenicus W²P³f Adiae benicus P² Arabicus,
om. Eβ 15 parans: moliens P² (cp. *Eutropius* 8.20) Hosdroena E hos-
phoenia α Osdhrena B edesa, E edyssam W²P² 16 propria morte:
codd., propria morte emendauit Hartke (secundum Meibom.), sed vide W. Schulze
Kl. Schriften (Göttingen, 1933) 159–60. ibidem: idem P 17 Aurelianus
GW¹P³ quas E id (in P²) post quasi add. Eα facto W quodam, om.
(in margine add.) W² 18 senatus W natus W² 19 imperiis G ipse
ante Persarum add. EαW¹P³ ipse nobilissimum Persarum regem W²
Serxer E Xersen α Dassem W¹ Xerxem f, cf. *Iord. Rom.* 280 gloriose,
om. W² 20 Alexandrum EPW¹ scriniorum E iscriniorum WP¹W²
ma magistrum P³

iuris consultorem. De Persis Romae pompa spectabili triumphavit. Sub Gordiano, acri ex iuventutis fiducia principe, rebellantes Parthi ingentibus proeliis contusi sunt. Isque rediens uictor de Perside fraude Philippi, qui praefectus praetorio eius
 5 erat, occisus est. Milites ei tumulum in uicensimo miliario a Circensio quod nunc exstat aedificauerunt atque exequias eius Romam cum maxima uenerationis reuerentia deduxerunt.

XXIII. Valeriani, infausti principis, fortunam taedet re-
 10 ferre. Is cum Gallieno suscepit imperium. Cum Valerianum exercitus, Gallienum senatus imperatorem fecisset, in Mesopotamia aduersum Persas Valerianus congressus a Sapore, Persarum rege, superatus est et captus in dedecori seruitute consenuit. Sub Gallieno Mesopotamia inuasa etiam Syriam
 15 sibi Persae coeperant uindicare, nisi quod turpe dictu est, Odenathus, decurio Palmyrenus, collecta Syrorum agrestium manu acriter restitisset et fuis aliquotiens Persis non modo nostrum limitem defendisset, sed etiam ad Ctesiphontem Romani ultor imperii, quod mirum dictu est, penetrasset.

1 consultum Bw Persis: Praessis WP¹ Romae, om. EWP¹W² pompas
 G expectabili Eα spectabile GP triumphavit E triumphauit (manu coae-
 ua? corr.) G 2 acri: agro E Augusto WP¹W¹P³ principe (Augusto
 in margine scriptum est) W², om. P² iubentutis E iuventutis P¹W²P²f
 iuentis W¹P³ acri ante fiducia add. W¹P³ principe: principi W¹P³, om.
 W² (vide supra) 3 rebellantis E ingenti WP¹ redigens W¹P³ 4
 pretorii EαW¹P³ praetorio (littera o expuncta, littera i manu coaeva? supra scripta
 est) G eius, om. Eα 5 est, om. WP¹ tumultum BP (secunda littera t
 statim? expuncta est E, manu coaeva? G) in, om. E vicesimo P²P³f xx⁰ W¹
 6 circesso αf castro post circensio add. αW¹f quod: que E qui W¹P³ quod
 nunc exstat om. α extat EBPW¹ exsequias GWP¹W¹ 7 uenera-
 tionis, om. Eα referentia E 9 ferre GP Valeriano WP¹ 10 im-
 peratores W² Mesopotamiam WW² 11 aduersus EW²P² congres-
 W¹P³ 12 dedecorem E dedecore αw dedecoris W¹ seruitute: sue
 vite (vite sue W²) Eα seruituti GP 13 Mesopotamiam EWW² Perse
 post Mesopotamia tr. W² inuasa: iaminuis erant E invaserant α 14
 Persae, om. W² ceperunt Perse E c(o)eperant Perse WP¹P² ceperunt E
 ceperant P¹P²W²W¹ caeperant PP³ dictum EBWW²W¹ (m expuncta P³)
 15 Odenathus: esodenaus E odenatus BGPWP¹W²W¹w ordenatus P²
 decorio WW² Palpirenus E Palmarenus W² collectas E Syrorum:
 prorum E 16 restisset W² effusis WW² effusus (littera i supra scripta est)
 P² aliquoties BP² 17 limitem: militem Eα defendit Eα Ctesi-
 phontem: etefontem E et hesifontem W a thesifontem P¹ thesifontem
 W² tesifontem P² Ctesifontem Bβ 18 altor β dictum EBWW²W¹
 penetrasse E penetravit α pertinuisse P

XXIV. Aureliani imperatoris gloriae Zenobia, Odenathi uxor, accessit. Ea enim post mortem mariti feminea dicione Orientis tenebat imperium. Quam Aurelianus multis cli-
banariorum et sagittariorum milibus fretam apud Immas haut
procul ab Antiochia uicit et captam Romae triumphans ante
currum duxit. Cari imperatoris uictoria de Persis nimium
potens superno numini uisa est. Nam ad inuidiam caelestis
indignationis pertinuisse credenda est. Is enim ingressus Persi-
dam quasi nullo eam obsistente uastauit, Cochen et Ctesiphon-
tem, urbes Persarum nobilissimas, cepit. Cum uictor totius
gentis castra supra Tigridem haberet, ui fulminis ictus interiit.

XXV. Sub Diocletiano principe pompa uictoriae nota de Persis est. Maximianus Caesar prima congressione, cum contra innumeram multitudinem cum paucis acriter dimicasset, pul-
sus recessit ac tanta a Diocletiano indignatione susceptus est,
ut ante carpentum eius per aliquot milia passuum cucurrerit
purpuratus. Et cum uix impetrasset, ut reparato de limitaneis
Daciae exercitu euentum Martis repeteret, in Armenia maiore
ipse imperator cum duobus equitibus explorauit hostes, et cum
uiginti quinque milibus militum superueniens castris hostilibus
subito innumera Persarum agmina adgressus ad internicionem
cecidit. Rex Persarum Narseus effugit, uxor eius et filiae captae

1 denati E odinati WP¹ odenati W¹W² ordenati P² 2 ea: et Eα
3 multas E multes P¹ glibaariorum B 4 et sagittariorum, om. B
fretus Eα haut: aut EWP¹ 5 victi P¹ Romam EWP² Roma P¹
triumfans E 6 Cari: ari W¹ de Persis: dispersis G 7 fuit post
potens add. α 7/8 superno . . . credenda est, om. α 8 est post in-
gressus add. GPW¹ et post Persidam add. W¹P³ 9 nullo eam obsist-
ente: scripsi secundum B nullo ei obsistente Eα nullo obsistente β nullo
obsistente eam, Hartke, p. 64 Ctesiphontem: Ctthesifontem E Thesifon-
tem α Ctesifontem Bβ 10 nonvilissimas E coepit BG caepit WP²
11 gentes WP¹ super P² Tigriden G ui, om. Eα vulminis P ictu α
12 pampa B de Persis nota est W² nota de: notandae E 13 est,
om. B Maximus P² 14 paucis: pacis W¹ 15 ac: hec E hoc α
ob hoc P² indignatione a Dioclitiano Eα 16 eius: est P (litteris ex-
punctis, eius manu coaeva? supra scriptum est G) 17 est (expunctum) post
purpuratus add. G unus post cum add. B imperasset WP¹W² reparatu
WP¹W² limitaneos β 18 exercitum EW¹P³ euentum, om. W¹ Ar-
moeniam GP³ Armeniam P maiorem GW¹P³ 20 in ante castris add.
W² hostibus GP 21 innumeram B in munera P ad: sed B, om. P
internecionem βW² 22 cedit W¹P³ effugiit E effugiet WP¹ et
fugit (t expuncta) G et ante uxor add. W² et, om. G

sunt et cum maxima pudicitiae custodia reseruatae. Pro qua admiratione Persae non modo armis, sed etiam moribus Romanos superiores esse confessi sunt. Mesopotamiam cum Transtigritanis regionibus reddiderunt. Pax facta usque ad
5 nostram memoriam rei publicae utilis perdurauit.

XXVI. Constantinus rerum dominus extremo uitae suae tempore expeditionem parauit in Persas. Toto enim orbe pacatis gentibus et recenti de Gothis uictoria gloriosior cunctis in Persas descendebat agminibus. Sub cuius aduentu Babyloniae
10 in tantum regna trepidarunt, ut supplex ad eum legatio Persarum adcurreret, facturos se imperata promitterent, nec tamen pro adsiduis eruptionibus, quae sub Constantio Caesare per Orientem temptauerant, ueniam mererentur.

XXVII. Constantius in Persas uario ac magis difficili pugnavit euentu. Praeter leues excubantium in limite congressiones acriori Marte nouiens decertatum est, per duces suos septiens, ipse praesens bis adfuit. Verum pugnis Sisaruenta, Singarena et iterum Singarena, praesente Constantio, ac Sicgarena, Constantiensi quoque, et cum Amida capta est, graue
20 sub eo principe res publica uulnus accepit. Ter autem a Persis

1 pudiciae W² sunt *post* pudicitiae *add.* GW¹P³ custodiae G 2 administratione βf non: num(n?) WP¹ sed etiam moribus, *om.* Eα, *vide infra* superioris GP 3 sed (a)etiam maioribus *ante* Mesopotamiam *add.* Eα 4 quinque *ante* regionibus *add.* EP¹W²P² transtigranis E transtigranis α transtygrita W¹ 5 nostram: mon P¹ 6 rerum: rex W² suo P¹ 8 recentis GP cunctis: multis α (*cum supra scriptum est* W²) 9 agminibus *ante* in *tr.* W² descendit W² adventum EWP¹W² 10 regna in tantum W² trepidaverunt EWP¹P² temuerunt W² ut: et G legatio Persarum *ante* ad *tr.* W² 11 occurreret EWP¹P² veniret W² 12 erudicionibus W¹ Constantino α 13 merentur EBf meruerunt α 14 Constantinus W¹ difficile E 15 limitate P limitaneo P² congressionis WP¹ 16 acriori: maiori Eα Marte: morte Eα arte B novies EPαW¹ decertatu P¹ 17 septies EPα es *post* septiens *add.* W¹P³ bis: suis B fuit E pugnis, *om.* Eα Sisaruenta: hisabena E hisavena α 18 Singarena: sincarena EB et iterum Singarena, *om.* Eα Singarena (*post* iterum): singare B ac: ad W¹P³ Sicgarena: segarena Eα sicgarena (*littera c expuncta, littera n manu coeua? supra scripta est*) G signarem W¹P³ 19 Constantiniensi EBGWP¹ Narasanensi P² Constantiniensis W¹P³ 20 est a Persis EWP¹W²

est obsessa Nisibis, sed maiore sui detrimento dum obsidet
 hostis adfectus est. Narasarensi autem, ubi Narseus occiditur,
 superiores discessimus. Nocturna uero Eliensi prope Singaram
 pugna, ubi praesens Constantius adfuit, omnium expeditionum
 compensatus fuisset euentus, si locis et nocte aduersantibus, 5
 percitos ferocia milites ab intempestiuo pugnandi tempore
 imperator ipse adloquendo reuocare potuisset. Qui tamen
 inuicti uiribus, inprovisis aduersum sitim aquarum subsidiis
 incumbente iam uespere, castra Persarum adgressi ruptis
 munitionibus occuparunt, fugatoque rege, cum a proelio re- 10
 spirantes praetentis luminibus repertae inhiarent aquae, nimbo
 sagittarum obruti sunt, cum stolide ad dirigendos certius in se
 ictus lumina ipsi per noctem accensa praeberent.

XXVIII. Iuliano in externos hostes expertae felicitatis
 principi aduersum Persas modus defuit. Is enim ingenti appa- 15
 ratu, utpote totius orbis regnator, infesta in Parthos signa
 commouit, instructam commeatibus classem per Euphraten
 inuexit. Strenuus in ingressu multa Persarum oppida et castella
 aut suscepit dedita aut manu cepit. Cum contra Ctesiphontem
 in ripa Tigridis et Euphratis iam mixti castra haberet, ludosque 20

1 est, *om.* P² nitibis BP (*manu coeua? supra corr.* G) insibis W¹ sed: et Eα
 maiores W¹P³ suo E obsedit α 2 est, *om.* WP¹ Narasarensi EP²
 Naranensi WP¹W² Nararensi Gf Narararensi P Narnarensi W¹P³
 occiditur P occidetur P¹ 3 nocturna P (*manu coeua? supra corr.* G) Eliensi:
 Elliensis GPW¹f, *om.* Eα Singuram WP¹W² 4 Constantinus W¹P³
 expeditionem omnium P³ expeditionum: expeditione P² expedicionem
 W¹, *om.* GP omnium, *om.* W¹ 5 compensates WP¹ 6 infestivo
 WP¹W² 7 alloquendi P² 8 ut *post* uiribus *add.* P² improvis P
 situm W¹ 9 incumbent etiam GP castris WP¹W² adgressis EWP¹.
 W² 10 occuparet P¹ occuparent P² a: ad Eα proelium α pros-
 pera *post* proelio *add.* P² sperantes α 11 praetentis: petentibus
 WP¹W², *om.* P² fluminibus GP repertis luminibus P² rep(p)ertis
 WP¹P² reperti W² aquae, *om.* Eα enim bo P 12 obrupti P³
 certius: certis E certos P², *om.* WP¹W² 13 ictis W¹P³ nocte E
 accessa B 14 in, *om.* E externes P extremos W² 15 principia
 Eα aduersus EWP¹W² modus defuit, *om.* E defuistis enim B is: huius
 E hos WP¹W² 16 ut put(a)e GP regnator, *om.* P Parthos: thos P
 17 instructa Eα infructam P commeantibus WP¹W² commeatus P²
 classe EBα Euphraten *codd.* 18 extrenuus E et strennue W² in, *om.*
 EPWP¹W² ingressum B ingressus W² et: aut E 19 coepit BGW
 Ctesiphontem EBβ Thesiphontem α 20 Euftratis EWP¹W² Euftrates P²
 Euftratae B Euftrate G Ufratei P Euftraten W¹P³ Euphratae w iam
 mixti: ammixit P haberent Eα

- campestres, ut hosti sollicitudinem demeret, per diem agitas-
 tasset, noctis medio inpositos nauibus milites in ulteriorem
 ripam repente transtulit. Qui per ardua nitentes, qua difficilis
 etiam per diem et nullo prohibente fuisset ascensus, Persas
 5 terrore subito miscuerunt uersisque agminibus totius gentis
 apertas Ctesiphontis portas uictor miles intrasset, nisi maior
 praedarum occasio fuisset quam cura uictoriae. Tantam adeptus
 gloriam, cum de reditu a comitibus admoneretur, intentioni
 suae magis credidit et exustis nauibus, cum a transfuga qui se
 10 ad fallendum obiecerat inductus uiae in Madaenam compendia
 sectaretur, dextrum aduersa Tigridis ripa nudato militum
 latere iter relegens, cum incautius per agmen erraret, excito
 puluere erepto suorum conspectu ab obuiio hostium equite
 conto per ilia ictus inguinum tenus uulneratus est. Inter
 15 effusionem nimii sanguinis, cum suorum ordines licet saucius
 instaurasset, cunctantem animam multa suos adlocutus efflauit.

- XXIX. Iouianus proeliis superiorem sed confusum subita
 morte amissi imperatoris suscepit exercitum. Cum commeatus
 deficerent et uia in reditu prolixior inmineret, Persae crebis
 20 incursibus nunc a fronte, nunc a tergo mediorum quoque latera
 incursantes iter agminis morarentur: consumptis aliquot diebus

1 campestribus P² acitasset GP 2 nostis B in *post* noctis *add.* P
 inpositis EPWP¹W² 3 repete P transvexit Eα adua P difficiles
 WP¹W² 4 prohibentes W¹ accessus E ascens P 5 terrores P
 subito terrore W² gentes W 6 aperta B apertis α Csicfontem E
 Thesifontem α Ctesifontis Bβ portis α nisi: ni P² 7 praedarum:
 praeclarum P¹ qua EWP¹W² Tantam adeptus gloriam, *om.* Eα 8
 intentionis EGPP¹ 9 et, *om.* EP² exutis α a, *om.* B (*in margine add.*
 W²) transfiga B qui: quodam P² 10 fellendum E obicerant E obi-
 cerat B inducitur WP¹W² Madeniam E Medenam P² Medeneam B
 Madeneam βWP¹W²fw, *cf. c.* XV et XVIII ut *ante* compendia *add.* W²
 compendiae WP¹W² 11 sectaret P¹ dextram P² dextro W¹P³ ad-
 versi P² ripam α nudata W¹ 12 latere legens (*iter re-, om.*) GP
 excita WP¹W² excitato P² 13 ereptus esuprum E ereptus e suorum
 α consectu GP ab hostium obvio W² 14 conto: contento G ingy-
 num BGP inguino W² inguium P² tentus E 15 effusione E
 nimis B licet, *om.* α saucius: avictos E au(c)tos α 16 cunctantem:
 constantem B adlocatus G afflavit P² 17 Iulianus WP¹W² Iovi-
 anus (*litterae ni supra scriptae sunt*) W¹ proelii WW² prelii P¹ praelio P²
 subita: vita E vitam WP¹W², *om.* P² 18 imperatores (*manu coeua?*
supra corr. G) P 19 dificerent B et viam reditu P 20 excursibus
 E excussibus α 21 iter: inter α agmina W² agminibus P²

tanta reuerentia Romani nominis fuit, ut a Persis prius sermo
de pace haberetur ac reduci confectus inedia exercitus sineretur
condicionibus (quod numquam antea accidit) dispendiosis
Romanae rei publicae inpositis ut Nisibis et pars Mesopotamiae
traderetur, quibus cupidior regni quam gloriae Iouianus in 5
imperio rudis adqueiuit.

XXX. Quam magno deinceps ore tua, princeps inuicte,
facta sunt personanda! Quibus me licet inparem dicendi nisu
et aeuo grauiorem parabo. Maneat modo concessa dei nutu et
ab amico, cui credis et creditus es, numine indulta felicitas, ut 10
ad hanc ingentem de Gothis etiam Babyloniae tibi palma pacis
accedat.

1 reuerentia E reverenti P 2 de pace sermo W² viae *post* reduci *add.*
P² sineretur, *om.* GW¹P³ sine *post* sineretur *add.* W² 3 numquam
antea: numantea E accedit G despersionis B dispendiis W¹W²P³ 4
Romae P² Nisibis: Zinivis EWP¹ Zimius W² 5 cupidior P gloria B
Ioviani P² 6 rudis, *om.* P² 7 quam: va W¹ qua P³ ore tua
princeps, *om.* Eα ore tu pro inceptus G ore tuo inceptus P sint *post* inuicte
add. W² 8 facta: factae G, *om.* Eα sint W¹ me, *om.* W¹P³ inparem:
imperem E in GP impar W¹P³ praedicendi β 9 gravior me Eαβ
parabo: personabo W¹P³ quibus licet impar *post* parabo *add.* W¹ con-
cessu E coccassa P¹ et ab amico, *om.* α 10 es: est P¹ nomine E
ut: et W² 11 ad, *om.* α hanc: an E hac Pα sicut *post* ingentem
add. α

THE SOURCES OF THE *BREVIARIUM*

VARIOUS scholars have suggested six possible sources for the *Breviarium* of Festus: Florus, Eutropius, the *Periochae* of Livy, a lost Chronicon, the lost Epitome of Livy, and several lost Kaisergeschichte.¹ Of these, only Eutropius may be considered a possible source for the entire *Breviarium* – i.e. the Kaisergeschichte certainly would not include Republican history, Florus and the *Periochae* terminate with the reign of Augustus, and neither the Epitome of Livy nor the Chronicon (as reconstructed by Sanders and Reinhold) reports post-Augustan events. For Republican history, Florus, Eutropius, the *Periochae*, the Epitome of Livy, and/or the Chronicon may have been used; for Imperial history Festus may have borrowed from Eutropius or the Kaisergeschichte. In addition, we shall have to determine whether Festus borrowed directly from an extant source other than Florus, Eutropius, or the *Periochae*. If it can be demonstrated that the *Breviarium* contains information not

¹ Relevant source studies will be cited by author:

Ay – G. Ay, *De Livii epitoma deperdita* (Leipzig, 1894).

Enmann – A. Enmann, 'Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser,' *Philologus* Supp. IV (1884), 337–501.

Hartke – W. Hartke, *De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones* (Leipzig, 1932).

Jacobi – R. Jacobi, *De Festi Breviarii fontibus* (Bonn, 1874).

Reinhold – G. Reinhold, *Das Geschichtswerk des Livius als Quelle späterer Historiker* (Berlin, 1898).

Sanders – H. Sanders, 'The Lost Epitome of Livy', in *UMichStud.* I, 1904, 255.

————, 'The Oxyrhynchus Epitome of Livy and Reinhold's Lost Chronicon', *TAPhA* 36 (1905), 5–31.

Wölfflin – E. Wölfflin, 'Das Breviarium des Festus', *ALL* 13 (1904), 69–98.

————, 'Chronicon Eutropiani Simillimum', *ALL* 12 (1903), 333 ff.

In addition, the following works should be consulted:

A. Eussner, 'Julius Florus und Festus Rufus', *Philologus* 37 (1874), 154–61.

V. Gardthausen, *Die Geographischen Quellen Ammians* (Leipzig, 1873).

E. Klebs, 'Die Sammlung der Scriptores Historiae Augustae', *RhM* 45 (1890), 436–64.

E. Kornemann, 'Die neue Livius-Epitome aus Oxyrhynchus', *Klio* Beiheft II (Leipzig, 1904).

C. Wagener, 'Eutropius', *Philologus* 42 (1884), 521 ff.

found in the extant histories, then we must conclude that Festus used one of the 'lost' histories. To facilitate examination of the evidence we may divide the *Breviarium* into three sections: chs. II–XIX, XX–XXIV, and XXV–XXIX (hereafter designated as section I, II, III). Chs. I and XXX – which contain the dedication to Valens, a brief statement of purpose, and the closing remarks to the Emperor on the eve of his Persian expedition – clearly were written by Festus and do not require source analysis.

Included in section I are a chronology for Roman history *ab urbe condita* to A.D. 364, a survey of the Roman provinces, an historical narrative of selected Republican events, and scattered references to Imperial history (which will be considered under section II). Of these, only the chronology in ch. II seems attributable to a single, extant history. Reinhold (p. 9) believed that this chronology was derived from a lost Chronicon. In support of this theory he cited four passages in ch. II which indicated an intermediary source between the lost Epitome of Livy and Festus. Since each of these proofs has been carefully, and I think correctly, refuted by Sanders,¹ we need not re-examine their validity. Sanders suggested alternatively that Eutropius alone provided the information found in ch. II. 'The only real difference is that Eutropius does not give the length of Servius Tullius' reign: Festus could, however, obtain it by the easiest combination, or from the Epitome of Livy, which also had the same, and was known to him.'² Although I am not convinced that the Epitome was known to Festus, I think Sanders' suggestion that Festus could *add* is not unreasonable. On the other hand, it should be observed that the structure of ch. II is *not* similar to Eutropius, but resembles very closely the chronological form found in the *Liber Generationis* and the *Origo Urbis Romae*.³ The uniform 'regnauit annos' parallels these chronica much more than Eutropius, who gives the *dies mortis* for each king. This stylistic variation, however, cannot be used to prove the existence of a lost chronicon. In short, since the information in ch. II was available in Eutropius, I am not prepared to postulate a lost source.

¹ *TAPhA* 36 (1905), 13–15.

² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³ See Mommsen, *Chronica Minora* 1.

The provincial lists in section I present a somewhat different problem for source analysis. If Festus was a member of Valens' administration (as I have suggested), it is possible that the provincial lists in chs. IV, V, VI, VIII and IX were copied from an official provincial list – e.g. a list similar to the Not. Dign.¹ However, since we possess no list for this period (i.e. around 370), nor does any extant list of an earlier date contain an identical arrangement of the provinces, we cannot prove his dependence upon a list. Indeed, it is unnecessary to impute his lists to a 'source', for it is not impossible that he supplied them from memory.

M. Galdi² has suggested that Festus inserted the provincial lists in order to give his work 'un'impronta di originalità'. Certainly the inclusion of provincial lists in a narrative history was an innovation. Florus, Eutropius, and the *Periochae* did not give such lists, nor can we readily cite a parallel in other extant histories. Velleius Paterculus (2. 38. 9) provides an account of the acquisition of the provinces, but this parallels Festus' narrative in chs. IV–XIV rather than the lists. Similarly, the geographical treatises of Strabo, Pomponius Mela, and others are of the *expositio totius mundi* genre and do not contain lists of the Roman provinces. In short, the insertion of provincial lists in a narrative history was unprecedented. It is worth noting that Festus' model was imitated by the leading historian of the fourth century, Ammianus Marcellinus (cp. 15. 11, 27. 4. 12–13, 22. 16, 14. 8).

We may now turn to an analysis of the possible sources for the narrative portion of section I. By the end of the nineteenth century the Republican material in section I had been attributed variously to Florus, Eutropius, and the *Periochae*. Concomitant investigation of a wider group of Imperial historians initiated a controversy which is not yet resolved. The debate centred upon the hypothesis that many Imperial Latin historians derived their information for Republican affairs from a lost Epitome of Livy. The 'proofs' of this hypothesis – carefully worked out by Ay and Sanders – are relevant to the present

¹ Cf. Jacobi, p. 37: 'provinciarum nomina, quae Festus in extremis IV–IX adponit, ex provinciarum aliquo indice sumpta esse . . . exposui.'

² *L'epitome nella Letteratura Latina* (Napoli, 1922), 237.

investigation only insofar as they provide a clue to the sources of Festus. Similarly, the hypothesis put forth by Reinhold (and the vigorous rejection of it by Sanders), that another source – a lost *Chronicon* – lies between the *Epitome* and a group of later writers, require comment only in part. Nevertheless, in addition to the extant histories which may have been used by Festus, the *Epitome* and the *Chronicon* – as reconstructed by Sanders and Reinhold – must be considered as possible sources for section I of the *Breviarium*. Indeed, I believe the evidence points either to a combination of sources, extant and lost, or to the exclusive use of a lost history or lost histories. The validity of this hypothesis will be established if it can be demonstrated that Festus includes information not found in Florus, Eutropius, the *Periochae*, or any other extant history written before 369/70.¹ The ‘unique’ material may be classified as follows: that which may have been added by Festus without the aid of a source; that which may be attributed only to a ‘lost’ history. Suspected errors in the manuscript transmission and historical errors which may be attributed to Festus – both of which provide ‘unique’ material – have been discussed above, p. 35.

In analysing derivative histories one must resist the temptation to attribute all the material to a source. Even the most conscientious epitomizer infuses a thought of his own on occasion. In the *Breviarium* this ‘originality’ is restricted to patriotic rhetoric and occasional ‘clarification’ (very often confusion) through correction of or addition to the source. The following italicized excerpts – for which there is no parallel in Florus, Eutropius, or the *Periochae* – will illustrate the limits of Festus’ originality.

1. *Examples of patriotic additions:*

(a) Festus X: Asia societate Attali regis nota Romanis est eamque Attali testamento relictam hereditario iure possedimus.

¹ Passages in extant histories, with which I have compared the text of the *Breviarium*, are taken from the following editions: Florus (ed. E. Malcovati [1938]), Eutropius (ed. H. Droysen, in *MGH: AA II* [1879]), *Periochae* (ed. O. Rossbach [1910]). For the most part, the text of passages in Florus and Eutropius, which Festus excerpted or paraphrased, is supported unanimously by the MSS; occasional MS variants, however, have been noted whenever they seem to indicate an ancient reading, known to Festus, which has disappeared through scribal error or emendation.

Ne quid tamen populus Romanus non uiribus partum haberet, armis per nos ab Antiocho, Syriarum rege maximo, est uindicata.

On the testamentum Attali cf. Florus 1. 35. 2-3; Eutropius 4. 18; *Periochae* 58. Festus probably used Florus as his source; the appended piece of rhetoric may be a corrective to Florus' statement 'adita igitur hereditate provinciam P. R. non quidem bello nec armis, sed, quod aequius, testamenti iure retinebat'.

(b) Festus XI: *Semper inter auxilia nostra fuere Cappadoces et ita maiestatem coluere Romanam, ut in honorem Augusti Caesaris Mazaca, ciuitas Cappadociae maxima, Caesarea cognominaretur.*

Eutropius 7. 11. 2: (Tiberius) maximam civitatem (Cappadociae) appellari nomine suo iussit, quae nunc Caesarea dicitur, cum Mazaca antea vocaretur. Not only is the creation by Imperial command in Eutropius changed by Festus to a voluntary homage to the Roman maiestas, but also the renaming of Mazaca is dated to the reign of Augustus, rather than Tiberius (as in Eutropius). Clearly, Festus obtained part, if not all, of his information from a lost source.

(c) Festus XVIII: *Qua congressione Pacorum regis filium eadem die, qua Crassus fuerat uictus, occidit, ne aliquando Romani ducis mors inulta relinqueretur.* Ventidius de Persis primus triumphauit.

Eutropius 7. 5. 2: Pacorum regis Orodis filium interfecit eo ipso die, quo olim Oroses, Persarum rex, per ducem Surenam Crassum occiderat. Hic primus de Parthis iustissimum triumphum Romae egit.

Periocha 128: P. Ventidius, legatus M. Antoni, Parthos in Syria proelio vicit regemque eorum occidit.

Cp. Vell. 2. 78. 1; Orosius 6. 18. 23 – ea scilicet die, qua Crassus a Parthis fuerat occisus. Commenting on this passage Reinhold (p. 19) concluded: 'wenn Festus *victus* schreibt statt *occisus*, so hat er selbst hier seinen Autor geändert; fährt er doch fort: *Ne aliquando* etc. . . .' Victus may indicate that Festus altered his source, but this alone does not preclude his dependence upon Eutropius. Nor is it 'proved' that Festus altered a source (clearly not Eutropius) to obtain *ne aliquando* etc. This may simply be a patriotic addition, perhaps suggested by Florus 2. 19. 7: sic Crassianam cladem Pacori caede pensauimus (cp. Jord. *Rom.* 237). On the other hand, Hartke (p. 49)

investigation only insofar as they provide a clue to the sources of Festus. Similarly, the hypothesis put forth by Reinhold (and the vigorous rejection of it by Sanders), that another source – a lost *Chronicon* – lies between the *Epitome* and a group of later writers, require comment only in part. Nevertheless, in addition to the extant histories which may have been used by Festus, the *Epitome* and the *Chronicon* – as reconstructed by Sanders and Reinhold – must be considered as possible sources for section I of the *Breviarium*. Indeed, I believe the evidence points either to a combination of sources, extant and lost, or to the exclusive use of a lost history or lost histories. The validity of this hypothesis will be established if it can be demonstrated that Festus includes information not found in Florus, Eutropius, the *Periochae*, or any other extant history written before 369/70.¹ The ‘unique’ material may be classified as follows: that which may have been added by Festus without the aid of a source; that which may be attributed only to a ‘lost’ history. Suspected errors in the manuscript transmission and historical errors which may be attributed to Festus – both of which provide ‘unique’ material – have been discussed above, p. 35.

In analysing derivative histories one must resist the temptation to attribute all the material to a source. Even the most conscientious epitomizer infuses a thought of his own on occasion. In the *Breviarium* this ‘originality’ is restricted to patriotic rhetoric and occasional ‘clarification’ (very often confusion) through correction of or addition to the source. The following italicized excerpts – for which there is no parallel in Florus, Eutropius, or the *Periochae* – will illustrate the limits of Festus’ originality.

1. *Examples of patriotic additions:*

(a) Festus X: Asia societate Attali regis nota Romanis est eamque Attali testamento relictam hereditario iure possedimus.

¹ Passages in extant histories, with which I have compared the text of the *Breviarium*, are taken from the following editions: Florus (ed. E. Malcovati [1938]), Eutropius (ed. H. Droysen, in *MGH: AA II* [1879]), *Periochae* (ed. O. Rossbach [1910]). For the most part, the text of passages in Florus and Eutropius, which Festus excerpted or paraphrased, is supported unanimously by the MSS; occasional MS variants, however, have been noted whenever they seem to indicate an ancient reading, known to Festus, which has disappeared through scribal error or emendation.

Eutropius 6. 13: *Adempta est ei Syria, Phoenice Sophanene. . . .*

Periocha 101: Tigranen in deditionem accepit eique ademptis Syria Phoenice Cilicia regnum Armeniae restituit.

Cp. Vell. 2. 37. 5; Jord. *Rom.* 234. Reinhold (proof no. 8, p. 9) attributes this passage to the Chronicon and Sanders (p. 152) traces it to the Epitome – neither discusses the addition of Mesopotamia. Except for this Festus could have obtained his account from Eutropius. Hartke (pp. 43–4) thinks Festus confused Eutropius' accounts of Pompey's victory over Tigranes and Lucullus' victory over Mithridates (6. 8. 4): Armenia quoque minor, quam tenuerat (cf. Festus ch. III) eidem sublata est. Susceptus tamen est Mithridates post fugam a Tigrae Armeniae rege, qui tum ingenti gloria imperabat, Persas saepe vicerat, Mesopotamiam occupaverat et Syriam et Phoenices partem. Certainly such confusion is possible. Indeed, it is possible that Festus reproduces Eutropius 6. 13 in ch. XIV, but in ch. XVI confuses with this Eutropius' account of Lucullus' victory over Mithridates.

(d) Festus XVII: Marcus Crassus consul aduersus rebellantes Parthos missus est. Is cum pacem missa a Persis legatione rogaretur, *apud Ctesiphonta* responsurum se ait.

Florus 1. 46. 4–5: . . . et cum apud Nicephorium castra posuisset, missi ab Orode rege legati denuntiavere, percussorum cum Pompeio foederum Sullaque meminisset. Regis inhians ille thesauris, nihil ne imaginario quidem iure, Selucia se responsurum esse respondit.

As Jacobi (p. 38) observed, 'Selucia et Ctesiphon paene eundem locum significant'; Festus carelessly may have altered Florus. On the other hand, it is possible that he found Ctesiphon in his source (an intermediary lost history).

For the information in the foregoing citations, Festus' dependence upon a lost history is merely possible; more conclusive evidence now may be considered. In the following excerpts, material not found in Florus, Eutropius or the *Periochae* is italicized.

3. *The following information cannot be traced to any extant history:*

(a) Festus IX: *Europae maritimas urbes antea Romana classis* (cp. Jord. *Rom.* 220).

(b) Festus XII: *Eius (Antiochus') filii regnum Syriae sub clientela populi Romani retinuerunt; quibus defunctis Syriarum prouinciis potiti sumus* (cp. Jord. *Rom.* 230).

(c) Festus III: . . . *contra Carduenos ac Saracenos et Arabas bellatum est*. . . .

Festus XVI: *Saracenos et Arabas uicit*.

Sanders (p. 152) considers these two passages examples of 'unconscious verbal repetition' (i.e. 'the recurrence of the same subject matter naturally suggested similarity of expression'). With this I agree. However, Sanders attributes each passage to the Epitome – which does not explain the appearance of Saracenos in Festus, and its absence from Florus, Eutropius and the *Periochae* (who used the Epitome, according to Sanders). Eutropius 6. 14 (and Orosius 6. 6. 1) reads 'Ituraeos et Arabas vicit', but are the Ituraeos the Saracenos of Festus? Hartke (p. 37, note 3) says that 'Petraeorum (found in Paeianius' Greek translation of Eutropius) et Saracenorum vocabula synonyma pro Arabum nomine sunt.' To substantiate this assertion with regard to the Saraceni, he cites Ammianus 23. 6. 12 (cf. 22. 15. 2): *Scenitas Arabas quos Saracenos posteritas appellauit*. Nonetheless, this does not establish the equivalence of Ituraei and Saraceni, nor Festus' dependence upon Eutropius at this point. Cardueni presents a similar problem. Hartke (p. 42, note 7) cites references in other authors to the region Carduenes, but points out that 'Cardueni hoc loco nusquam apud scriptores Latinos memorantur.' With regard to Festus' source, he concludes: 'unde Festus nomen hauscrit . . . satis diiudicari non potest (an ex uberiore quadam Epit. Liviana?).' Eutropius (1. 3. 1) reports Trajan's victory over them, but this cannot be the source of Festus, who states that a war was fought with them 'sub consulibus'. Clearly, Festus did not obtain his information from Florus, Eutropius, or the *Periochae*. On the other hand, information concerning the Arabas could have been obtained from *Periocha* 102, Eutropius 6. 14. 1, or Florus 1. 40. 29–30. Jordanes *Rom.* 235 seems to have borrowed from ch. XVI only: *Saracenos Arabasque exuperans Hierosolimam*.

(d) Festus IV: *Deinde Sicilia a praetoribus recta, postea est commissa praesidibus: nunc a consularibus administratur. Sardiniam*

et Corsicam Metellus uicit, triumphauit de Sardis (rebellauere saepe Sardi). Iuncta administratio harum insularum fuerat, post suos praetores habuit, nunc singulae a praesidibus reguntur.

No extant author provides all the facts given by Festus, but *Periochae* 46, 93, 123 do contain references to praetors in Sicily. In addition, the rule of consulars in Sicily and *praesides* in Sardinia and Corsica may have been added from Festus' own knowledge. Similarly, the observation *rebellauere saepe Sardi* may have been made by Festus. The remainder of the italicized passages, however, may be traced to a lost history.

(e) Festus VI: C. Caesar cum decem legionibus, *quae terna milia militum Italarum habuerunt*, per annos VIII ab Alpibus ad Rhenum usque Gallias subegit, cum transiuit, decimo anno Gallias et Britannias tributarias fecit.

Eutropius 6. 17. 1-3: [Gaius Iulius Caesar] cum legionibus decem. . . . domuit autem annis novem fere omnem Galliam, quae, inter Alpes flumen Rhodanum, Rhenum et Oceanum est. . . . Brittanis mox bellum intulit. . . . eos quoque victos obsidibus acceptis stipendiarios fecit. Galliae autem tributi nomine annum imperavit sestertium quadringenties, Germanosque trans Rhenum adgressus inmanissimis proeliis vicit.

Despite the material correspondence with Eutropius, a single clause points to dependence upon a complementary source. However one interprets *quae . . . habuerunt* – C. Caesar with ten legions, 'which had 3000 Italian soldiers each' or 'which had 3000 Italian soldiers (i.e. ten legions plus 3000 Italian soldiers) – it is clear that Festus did not obtain the information from Eutropius. T. R. Holmes (*Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* [1931], 562) somewhat arbitrarily concludes that 'this statement is of no use'.

(f) Festus VI: Postea Gallos cum uictoria remeantes Camillus qui in exsilio erat, *collecta de agris multitudine* oppressit; . . .

On Camillus cf. Eutropius 1. 20. 3. As Reinhold (p. 20) has demonstrated, Eutropius and the *Periochae* contain many parallels which may have suggested the phrase '*collecta . . . multitudine*': Eutropius 1. 9. 5; 14. 15; 6. 11. 1; *Periochae* 95, 56, 123. Jacobi (p. 28) cited the parallel in Festus XXIII '*collecta Syrorum agrestium manu*' and suggested that this could account

for Festus VI. In addition, cp. *De Viris Illustribus* 23. 9: 'Qui (Camillus) . . . collectis reliquiis Gallos . . . occidit.' In view of this, Reinhold suggests 'dass auch Festus jene Worte nicht erfunden, sondern seiner Quelle entnommen hat' Reinhold's explanation cannot be proved, but it seems probable. Of course, this does not suggest Festus' dependence upon the *De Viris Illustribus*, which otherwise does not parallel the *Breviarium*.

(g) Festus VII: Dardanos *et Moesios* Curio proconsul subegit et *primus Romanorum ducum* ad Danuvium usque pervenit.

Eutropius 6. 2. 2: Missus ei successor Gaius Scribonius Curio post consulatum. Is Dardanos vicit et usque ad Danuvium penetravit. . . .

Periocha 95: C. Curio pro cos. Dardanos in Thracia domuit.

The principal consideration in this passage is *et Moesios*, for *primus Romanorum ducum* could have been supplied by Festus (a great many parallels for this expression may be found in the works of all the authors under review). Hartke (p. 39) suggests that Festus may have used a catalogue, similar to *Chron. Alex.* (*Chron. Min.* 1). This is a possibility, but unfortunately one which cannot be proved or disproved. Would such a catalogue contain historical references to Roman proconsuls/victors – e.g. Curio? Hartke seems to suggest that Festus borrowed 'unknown' peoples who lived near tribes mentioned in his source from the catalogue: 'ego Festum cum Sarmatas in planitie Parthisci domicilia habere sciret, ut nomen novum insereret, ex catalogo quodam nomen gentis alicuius quae prope Colchos habitaret, sumpsisse putaverim.' In short, if the Dardani were mentioned in his source, Festus would quickly thumb through his catalogue, pick out a neighbouring tribe, and insert it in his account. Why? He is not a great historian, but I doubt that he intentionally falsified information. Jordanes *Rom.* 216 retains this addition: Dardanos Mysosque Curion primum proconsul edomuit primusque omnium Romanorum Danubium amnem usque profectus cuncta eius loca vastavit.

(h) Festus IX: Marcus Lucullus per Thraciam cum Bessis primus conflixit. *Ipsam caput gentis Thraciam uicit*, Haemimontanos subegit, *Eumolpiadam quae nunc Philippopolis dicitur*,

Uscudamam *quae modo Hadrianopolis uocatur*, in dicionem nostram redegit, Cabylen cepit. Supra Pontum positas ciuitas occupauit: Apolloniam, Calathum, Parthenopolim, Tomos, Histrum; ad Danuuium usque perueniens Scythis arma monstrauit.

Eutropius 6. 10: Alter (i.e. M.) autem Lucullus . . . Bessis primus Romanorum intulit bellum atque eos ingenti proelio in Haemo monte superavit. Oppidum Uscudamam . . . vicit, Cabylen cepit usque Danuvium penetravit. Inde multas supra Pontum positas civitates adgressus est. Illic Apolloniam evertit, Callatim Parthenopolim Tomos Histrum Burziaonem cepit belloque confecto Romam rediit.

Reinhold (p. 7) points out that the sequence of events in Festus and Eutropius is not the same. In Festus, Lucullus takes Cabyle, seizes the Pontic cities, and comes up to the Danube; in Eutropius, Lucullus takes Cabyle, comes up to the Danube, *inde* he sets out to seize the Pontic cities. Obviously, Festus' account is geographically more probable, but does this signify anything more than a correction of Eutropius? Dependence upon a lost history, however, is suggested by the addition of *Eumolpiadam* (not mentioned by Reinhold), which cannot have been obtained from Eutropius. Of course, his use of another source does not preclude use of Eutropius – he may have combined them.

(i) Festus XI: Pamphyliam, Lyciam, *Pisidiam* Seruilius proconsul ad bellum piratarum missus obtinuit.

Florus 1. 41. 4–5: Missusque in eos (Cilices) Publius Servilius . . . non incruenta victoria superat. Sed nec mari submovisse contentus, validissimas urbes eorum . . . evertit. . . .

Eutropius 6. 3: Ad Ciliciam et Pamphyliam missus est Publius Servilius ex consule, vir strenuus. Ciliciam subegit, Lyciae urbes clarissimas oppugnavit et cepit. . . .

Periocha 93: P. Servilius procos. in Cilicia Isauros domuit, et aliquot urbes piratarum expugnavit.

One is tempted to explain this addition as interpolation or manuscript error, but such conjecture is not admissible in view of Jord. *Rom.* 223: Servilius proconsul . . . Pamphyliam, Lyciam Pisidiamque divicit. A lost history must have supplied this addition.

(j) Festus XIII: Cyrenas *cum ceteris ciuitatibus Libyae Pentapolis* Ptolomaei *Antiquioris* liberalitate suscepimus. Libyam supremo Appionis regis arbitrio sumus adsecuti.

Eutropius 6. 11. 2: Quo tempore Libya quoque Romano imperio per testamentum Apionis, qui rex eius fuerat, accessit, in qua inclutae urbes erant Berenice, Ptolemais, Cyrene (cp. Jord. *Rom.* 229).

Periocha 70: Ptolemaeus, Cyrenarum rex, cui cognomen Apionis fuit, mortuus heredem populum R. reliquit, et eius regni civitates senatus liberas esse iussit.

Cf. Obsequens 49: Ptolemaeus, rex Aegypti, Cyrenis mortuus senatum populumque Romanum heredem reliquit; Cassiodorus a. u. c. 658: Ptolemaeus, Aegypti rex, populum Romanum heredem reliquit; Jerome ann. 96: Ptolemaeus, rex Cyrenae, moriens Romanos testamento reliquit heredes.

Reinhold (p. 13) noted the variant readings rex Aegypti and rex Cyrenarum, but misinterpreted their significance. On the basis of the readings, he assigned Cassiodorus and Obsequens to the group represented by Festus and Eutropius (i.e. authors who supposedly used the *Chronicon*); *Periocha* 70, according to Reinhold, belongs to another group, which used the *Epitome* directly. As Sanders (p. 187) pointed out, 'Festus, instead of calling Ptolemaeus rex Aegypti as Cassiodorus and Obsequens did, mentions Cyrenae, thus agreeing with *Per. Liv.* (and Jerome).' Since Festus presents two versions (i.e. Cyrene was acquired from Ptolemy *Antiquioris* (?) and Libya from Appionis), Sanders (p. 186) suggested that 'Festus was evidently confused by the presence of two different statements in his sources and especially by the incorrect dates in Eutropius (66 B.C.)', and concluded 'it seems certain that the second statement of Festus came from Eutropius, so the first must be referred to another source, presumably the *Epitome*.' He also noted that *ciuitatibus Libyae Pentapolis* is not found elsewhere and must be an addition by Festus: 'He had obtained the information from the passage of Eutropius but carelessly transferred it to the passage borrowed from the *Epitome*.' Yet, is it not possible that Festus obtained both statements from the *Epitome* or another lost source?

(k) Festus XV: *Madaenam, opimam Armeniorum regionem, obtinuit, per Melitenam ad Mesopotamiam descendit, Nisibin cum fratre regis cepit.*

Eutropius 6. 9. 1: Inde Nisibin profectus eam quoque civitatem cum regis fratre cepit.

Madaena (Madena) appears in Eutropius 8. 3. 2, but not in this context – cum his gentibus, quae Madenam attingunt. Festus did not acquire his information from this reference and must have relied upon a lost history. However, he may have borrowed Nisibin cum fratre regis cepit from Eutropius; its rather isolated position at the end of the passage increases the possibility of a combination of sources.

(l) (i) Festus XV: Tigranen, Armeniorum regem, cum septem milibus clibanariis et centum uiginti sagittariorum, ipse cum decem et octo Romanorum milibus uicit. Tigranocertam, maximam Armeniae ciuitatem, expugnauit (cp. Jord. Rom. 232).

Eutropius 6. 9. 1: (Lucullus) Tigranocertam, civitatem Arzianenae nobilissimam regni Armeniaci, cepit ipsum regem (Tigranen) cum septem milibus quingentis clibanariis et centum milibus sagittariorum et armatorum venientem decem et octo milia militum habens ita vicit, ut magnam partem Armeniorum deleverit.

Reinhold (p. 5) contended that since the order of events – i.e. capture of Tigranes and then siege of Tigranocerta – is reversed correctly in Festus, 'folglich hat dieser dieselbe Quelle (i.e. the Chronicon) besser wiedergegeben als jener.' If Festus had written postea Tigranocertam, then Reinhold's contention would be acceptable; as it stands, I cannot discern any absolute alteration of sequence which proves the use of the Chronicon, instead of Eutropius. On the contrary, the linguistic similarity of the two passages suggests Festus' dependence upon Eutropius. However, there is a variation in Festus' account, which has not been noticed by Reinhold: the deletion of quingentis and the insertion of viginti. Either this variant was in Festus' source or results from an error in MS transmission. No MS supports an emendation. The deletion of quingentis may have occurred through haplography, but the addition of viginti is difficult to explain. Of course, scribal miscopying of numbers is not

uncommon, especially if the figures were expressed in Roman numerals in the archetype. Yet, how may *centum milibus* or *C milibus* become *centum viginti* <*milibus*> or *CXX* <*milibus*>? Whether Festus reproduces with greater accuracy a source used also by Eutropius (the view of Jacobi, p. 39), or obtained this number from a source not known to Eutropius cannot be determined. That a lost source was used, however, seems probable.

(ii) Festus XVI: Cn. Pompeius expertae felicitatis ad Mithridaticum bellum missus Mithridaten in Armenia minore nocturno adgressus proelio superavit, *caesis duobus et quadraginta milibus hostium* castra eius inuasit.

Florus 1. 40. 20–23: (Cn. Pompeius) regemque (Tigranem) fugientem media nactus Armenia – quanta felicitas viri! – uno proelio confecit. Nocturna ea dimicatio fuit et luna in partibus.

Eutropius 6. 12. 2: Quo suscepto Mithridaten in Armenia minore nocturno proelio vicit, castra diripuit, quadraginta milia eius occidit. . . .

Periocha 101: Cn. Pompeius Mithridaten nocturno proelio victum coegit Bosphoron profugere.

Cf. *Vir. Ill.* 76. 7 and Orosius 6. 4. 3. Except for *duobus* all the ingredients could have been supplied by Eutropius. However, since Jordanes *Rom.* 233 – for which Festus probably was the source – also reads *XLII milia*, we cannot assume that *duobus* is a scribal error. Reinhold (p. 14) attributes the entire passage to the *Chronicon*. Although he did not examine all the relevant evidence – he did not consider Florus at all, nor did he notice the addition *duobus* – his conclusion cannot be disproved. Sanders (p. 180) attributes the passage to Eutropius and the *Epitome*, which could account for *duobus*. As in (I)(i), we must conclude that Festus directly borrowed from a lost source.

(m) Festus XVI: Idem Pompeius *Bosphoranis* et Colchis Aristarchum regem inposuit. . . .

Eutropius 6. 14. 1: (Pompeius) Aristarchum Colchis regem inposuit.

The correspondence between Festus and Eutropius is literal – except for the addition of *Bosphoranis*. This addition is rather

surprising in view of the distance between the Bosphorani and the Colchi, who inhabited the Caucasus Mountains (modern Georgia). Indeed, the geographical implausibility of this 'kingdom' does not suggest a natural connection which could have led Festus to link the two tribes. Hartke (p. 37) considers this addition historically unsound: 'Falso Bosporani afferuntur, cum Colchis solis Aristarchum impositum esse constet.' Tzschukkius emended the text (Jacobi, p. 40, note 2) but Hartke (p. 38) rightly rejects this: 'hoc refutatur verbis Jordanis, qui cum haec narraret, Festi Breviarium secutus est: *Rom.* 234 "nam Bosporianis Colchisque Aristarcum regem Pompeius praeposuit". Hartke (p. 39) attributes the insertion of Bosphorani to a catalogue – which hypothesis I have discussed above (g). I attribute the insertion to a lost source (not a catalogue).

(n) Festus XVII: Lucius Cassius, quaestor Crassi, uir strenuus, reliquias fusi collegit exercitus. *Contra Persas in Syriam inrumpentes ter cum summa admiratione conflixit eosque trans Euphraten reiectos uastauit.*

Eutropius 6. 18. 2: (Gaius Cassius) Persas rediens trans Euphraten crebris proeliis vinceret.

Periocha 108: C. Cassius, quaestor M. Crassi, Parthos, qui in Syriam transcenderent, cecidit.

To Reinhold (p. 15), the source is certain: 'Dass diese Stelle dem Chronicon entstammt, beweist Eutrop 6. 18. 2...' As proof (p. 9) he points out that both Festus and Eutropius read C. Cassius and Persas. The MSS of the *Breviarium* uniformly read Lucius; Reinhold was misled by a careless emendation. Nor can I accept the reading Persas as proof, for Parthos and Persas were interchanged regularly in fourth-century histories including the *Breviarium*, in which the Parthians are even called Babylonians: cf. Hartke (p. 32, note 3) who, after examining the evidence concludes that 'nomina (Persas and Parthos) sine ulla differentia a scriptoribus huius aevi usurpabantur.' This passage may derive from the Chronicon, but Reinhold clearly has not summoned sufficient proof. More attractive is Sanders' suggestion (p. 180) that 'Festus is directly influenced by Eutropius, though also acquainted with the Epitome.' In this

connection it should be pointed out that Festus may have conflated and confused Eutropius 6. 18. 2 and 7. 5. 2. (L. Ventidius Bassus inrumpentes in Syriam Persas tribus proeliis vicit), which would account for *ter cum summa admiratione conflixit*. Yet, is a conflation of such unconnected passages probable? Dependence upon a lost history is an equally tenable explanation.

(o) Festus XVIII: P. Ventidius Bassus Parthos, qui ducente Labieno Syriam inuaserant, *occurens in Capro monte* cum paucis fugauit, Labienum occidit; persecutus Persas ad internicionem strauit.

Eutropius 7. 5. 2: . . . Lucius Ventidius Bassus inrumpentes in Syriam Persas tribus proeliis vicit.

Florus 2. 19. 5-7: . . . Ventidius . . . Labieni copias ipsumque Pacorum et omnem Parthicum equitatum toto inter Oronten et Euphraten sinu late occidisset. Viginti amplius milium fuit.

Periocha 127 (cf. 128): P. Ventidius, Antoni legatus, Parthos proelio victus Syria expulit Labieno, eorum duce, occiso.

This passage has been discussed at length by Reinhold and Hartke. To Reinhold this passage suggested 'proof' (no. 6) for the existence of the *Chronicon*. He points out (p. 9) that Festus and Eutropius read Bassus against *Periocha* 128 and Orosius 6. 18. 23 (add Florus 2. 19. 5-7) and concludes: 'Somit gehen auch hier wieder die *Periochae* und Orosius nach der einen, Eutrop und Festus nach der andern Seite auseinander.' Unfortunately, he failed to notice that Eutropius reads L. Ventidius against Festus and *Periocha* 127 (P. Ventidius). Hartke, who attributes the passage to the Epitome, accepts P. Ventidius in *Periocha* 127 (no MS variants), but rejects the emendation to P. in *Periocha* 128 (all codices read L.). He then asserts (p. 47, notes b and e) that in Eutropius 7. 5. 2 and *Periocha* 128 'Praenomen falsum pro Publii nomine iam ex epitoma Liviana haustum'. I cannot follow this argument. With regard to Bassus, he quotes (p. 48, note h) the Suetonius fragment (no. 210R = Gell. 15. 4. 4) concerning the triumph of Ventidius, in which he is referred to as Bassus. Reinhold (p. 16, note 1) rejects the relevance of this fragment since we do not know Suetonius' source. The significance of the variants - Publius, Lucius - and the validity of the cognomen Bassus are difficult to assess. Neither

divergence, however, can be cited as proof that Festus used Eutropius in this passage or that a lost source was consulted. Festus' source, in my view, simply cannot be determined. The reference to mons Caprus, on the other hand, may derive from a lost source (see above, p. 39).

On the basis of the foregoing examples it is certain that Festus extracted at least some of his information from a lost history. Much less certain are the answers to two basic, collateral questions: (1) from what lost history or histories did he borrow, and (2) did he combine this lost history with Eutropius, Florus and/or the *Periochae*? First, the extent to which Festus directly borrowed from Eutropius, Florus and/or the *Periochae* must be determined. As I have demonstrated above, material and linguistic correspondence between Eutropius and Festus is frequent and apparent. If Festus did not consult Eutropius directly, then he must have used Eutropius' source. Similarly, a number of passages in the *Breviarium* seem to have been obtained in part from Florus. A few examples of linguistic correspondence will illustrate this relationship:

(a) Florus 1. 33. 7: (Scipio) primusque Romanorum ducum victor ad Gades et Oceani ora pervenit.

Festus V: . . . usque Gadis ad Oceanum mare peruenimus.

(b) Florus 1. 39. 2: Nihil interim per id omne tempus residuum crudelitatis fuit in captivos saevientibus: litare dis sanguine humano, bibere in ossibus capitum. . . .

Festus IX: Multa de saevitia praedictorum (Scordisci) fabulosa memorantur, quod hostiis captiuorum diis suis aliquando litauerint, quod humanum sanguinem in ossibus capitum potare sint soliti.

(c) Florus 1. 39. 3: Saevissimi omnium Thracum Scordisci fuere. . . .

Festus IX: Saevissimi omnium gentium Thraces fuerunt.

(d) Florus 1. 39. 5: Didius vagos . . . intra suam reppulit Thraciam.

Festus IX: Marcus Didius uagantes Thraces repressit.

(e) Florus 1. 39. 5: Minucius toto vastavit Hebro . . . dum per perfidum glacie flumen equitatur.

Festus IX: Minucius in Hebri fluminis glacie uastavit.

(f) Florus 1. 46. 9: Ipse (Crassus) in conloquium sollicitatus, signo dato vivus in hostium manus incidisset, nisi tribunis reluctantibus fugam ducis barbari ferro occupassent.

Festus XVII: Ipse Crassus cum ad conloquium sollicitatus uiuus paene capi posset, repugnantibus tribunis euaserat et fugam petens occisus est.

(g) Florus 1. 46. 11: Caput eius recisum cum dextera manu ad regem reportatum ludibrio fuit, neque indigno. Aurum enim liquidum in rictum oris infusum est, ut cuius animus arserat auri cupiditate, eius etiam mortuum et exsanguie corpus auro ureretur.

Festus XVII: Caput eius cum dextera manu resectum ad regem perlatum est atque ita ludibrio habitum . . . ut faucibus eius aurum liquefactum infunderetur scilicet et qui ardens cupiditate praedandi . . . etiam mortui eius reliquias auri flamma conbureret.

To this evidence may be added the passage which is found in Festus XX: Traianus qui post Augustum Romanae rei publicae mouit lacertos. This clearly reproduces Florus' assessment (1. 1. 8): A Caesare Augusto in saeculum nostrum haud multo minus anni ducenti, quibus inertia Caesarum quasi consenuit atque decoxit, nisi quod sub Traiano principe movit lacertos. . . . Since this is found only in Florus' proem, Festus must have had Florus *ante oculos*.

The evidence for Festus' direct use of the *Periochae* is much less decisive. Linguistic parallels are limited to two passages:

(a) *Periocha* 127: Parthi Labieno, qui Pompeianarum partium fuerat, duce in Syriam inruperunt . . . totam eam provinciam occupaverunt.

Festus XVIII: Parthi Labieno qui Pompeianarum partium fuerat ac uictus ad Persas refugerat, duce in Syriam inruperunt ac totam prouinciam occuparunt.

Reinhold (p. 17), Hartke (p. 48), and Sanders (p. 180) all agree that this sentence was found in the lost Epitome of Livy.

(b) *Periocha* 130: M. Antonius . . . Mediam ingressus bellum . . . Parthis intulit . . . et cum duabus legionibus amissis. . . .

Festus XVIII: M. Antonius Mediam ingressus . . . bellum

Parthis intulit, et primis eos proeliis uicit. Post duabus legionibus amissis. . . .

The similarity is marked, but it seems dangerous to infer Festus' dependence upon the *Periochae* on the basis of these two passages. On the contrary, I think we may conclude that Festus, in section I, borrowed directly from Florus and Eutropius, but obtained the information in these passages from a lost history, which may have been the source of the *Periochae*.

Concerning the character and content of this lost history nothing can be determined with certainty. Both Reinhold and Sanders believed that an Epitome of Livy had been published from which later historians borrowed. Reinhold, however, thought that a chronicon (which used the Epitome) was necessary to explain differences between later historians (cf. his stemma p. 13). Sanders minimized these differences and attributed unique material in Festus and others to the Epitome, which he suggested (pp. 179-200) had been redacted twice. Hartke (p. 48) accepted Sanders' general presentation, but suggested that many more than two epitomes existed. I think Reinhold, Sanders, and Hartke have proved only that an infinite number of epitomes may be conjectured to account for the unique material in later historians. I cannot discern in the evidence any pattern which might provide a basis for certain reconstruction of an Epitome. It seems preferable merely to acknowledge the existence of an epitome or epitomes similar to the *Periochae*, from which Festus may have obtained his information. Moreover, I would suggest that Festus combined a lost history or lost histories with Florus and Eutropius. A further hypothesis seems inadvisable.

The sources for section II are equally difficult to ascertain. The extant Latin historians from which Festus may have borrowed are Eutropius, *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, and Aurelius Victor. In addition, it is possible that the Kaisergeschichte, (biographies of the Emperors from Augustus to Diocletian), as reconstructed by Enmann, and/or some other lost history or histories may have been used by Festus. In section II Festus repeats some information concerning Trajan and Hadrian which had been reported in earlier chapters. These repetitions

are found in ch. XX (cf. ch. XIV—ad extremum sub Traiano . . . esse uoluit). However, he does not repeat the following accounts found in section I: ch. VIII (Traianus Dacos . . . factae sunt), ch. XI (Postremo . . . Cappadocia migravit). For each of these Eutropius could have been the source (cf. 8. 6. 2, 8. 2. 2, 7. 11. 2). In the following excerpts, I have cited passages from the three extant histories which have parallels in section II of the *Breviarium*.

1. Festus XXI: Antoninus, cognomento Caracalla, filius Seueri imperatoris, expeditionem in Persas parans, in Osrhoena apud Edessam *propria morte obiit et ibidem sepultus est*.

Eutropius 8. 20. 2: (Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Bassianus, idemque Caracalla) defunctus est in Osdroena apud Edessam molens aduersum Parthos expeditionem anno imperii sexto, mense secundo, vix egressus quadragesimum tertium annum. Funere publico elatus est.

Vita Caracallae 6. 6; 9. 12: Deinde cum iterum vellet Parthis bellum inferre atque hibernaret Edessae atque inde Carrhas . . . venisset . . . insidiis a Macrino praefecto praetorii positis . . . interemptus est. Corpus eius Antoninorum sepulchro inlatum est. . . .

Vita Macrini 4. 7; 5. 2: Dein cum (Macrinus) esset praefectus praetorii . . . Antoninum Caracallam imperatorem suum interemit . . . dein corpus Antonini Romam remisit, sepulchris maiorum inferendum.

Victor, *Caesares* 21. 5: . . . cum Syriam circumgrederetur, apud Edessam anno potentiae sexto moritur; 21. 6: Corporis reliqua luctu publico relata Romam atque inter Antoninos funerata sunt.

Only Eutropius and Festus (cp. Jerome *ann.* 217, p. 213 [Helm]; Jord. *Rom.* 277) fail to report the burial of Caracalla at Rome. According to Hartke (p. 53), Eutropius merely overlooked this portion of the account in his source (= source of Victor?). Indeed, Eutropius indicates this by 'funere publico', which must have been held at Rome. Festus was confused by Eutropius' account and assumed that Caracalla was buried near Edessa: 'Vix enim e verbis eius (Eutropius) quispiam intellexerit Romae esse Caracallam sepultum.' This explanation is

credible, but Festus' dependence on a lost history cannot be excluded. The *Kaisergeschichte* reconstructed by Enmann regularly supplied the *Todesort* of the Emperors (Enmann, p. 437 ff.).

2. Festus XXII: Aurelius Alexander quasi fato quodam in exitium Persicae gentis renatus, iuuenis admodum Romani gubernacula suscepit imperii. Persarum regem nobilissimum Xersem gloriose uicit. Hic Alexander scriniorum magistrum habuit Ulpianum iuris consultorem. De Persis Romae pompa spectabili triumphauit.

Eutropius 8. 23: Successit huic Aurelius Alexander . . . iuuenis admodum, susceptoque adversus Persae bello Xerxen, eorum regem, gloriosissime vicit. . . . Adsessorem habuit vel scrinii magistrum Ulpianum, iuris conditorem.

Vita S. Alexandri 13. 7: Nata in domo laurus iuxta Persici arborem intra unum annum Persici arborem vicit. Unde etiam coniectores dixerunt Persas ab eo esse vincendos; 18. 55. 1: Magno igitur apparatu inde in Persas profectus Artaxerxen regem potentissimum vicit . . . ; 56. 1: Post hoc Romam venit triumphoque pulcherrimo acto. . . .

Victor *Caesares* 24. 2: Qui (Alexander) quamquam adolescens, ingenio supra aevum tamen confestim apparatu magno bellum adversum Xerxem, Persarum regem, movet. . . .

To Hartke (p. 29-30) Festus' account of the triumph – missing in Eutropius – indicated dependence upon two sources: 'excerpsit Festus Eutropii de Alexandro Severo caput; in fine ex fonte altero, quem scriptor Historiae Augustae secutus est, id, quod apud Eutropium desideravit, minus apte adiunxit.' This seems the most probable explanation, although it is possible that Festus did not use Eutropius at all, but obtained the entire passage from a lost history.

3. Festus XXII: Isque (Gordianus) rediens uictor de Perside fraude Philippi, qui *praefectus praetorio eius erat*, occisus est. Milites ei tumulum in uicensimo miliario a Circensio, quod nunc exstat, aedificauerunt atque exequias eius Romam cum maxima uenerationis reuerentia deduxerunt.

Eutropius 9. 2. 3: (Gordianus) rediens haud longe a Romanis finibus interfectus est fraude Philippi, qui post eum imperavit.

Miles ei tumulum vicesimo miliario a Circesio, quod castrum nunc Romanorum est Euphratae inminens, aedificavit, exequias Romam revexit, ipsum divum appellavit.

Vita Gordiani Tertii 28. 1: (Philippus) qui post eum (Misi-theus) praefectus praetorii est factus . . . ; 30. 8: . . . Gordianum . . . clamantem e conspectu duci iussit ac despoliari et occidi; 34. 2: Gordiano sepulchrum milites apud Circesium castrum fecerunt in finibus Persidi, titulum huius modi ad-dentes. . . . Cp. *Epit. de Caes.* 27. 3: Corpus eius prope fines Romani Persicique imperii positum nomen loco dedit sepulchrum Gordiani. Hartke (p. 52) points out that only Festus and Eutropius (cp. Jerome *ann.* 244, p. 217 [Helm]) report the transfer of Gordianus' remains to Rome. Other historians agree more or less with Ammianus 23. 5. 7: 'In hoc ubi sepultus est loco (Zaitha) vulnere impio cecidisset'. The agreement of Festus and Eutropius against the majority seems to indicate Festus' dependence upon Eutropius. Yet, there must be another source to account for praefectus praetorii – not in Eutropius. Admittedly, this information could have been obtained from *Vita Gordiani* 28. 1; the *Vita*, however, does not report the transfer of Gordianus' remains to Rome. Thus, either Festus borrowed from the *Vita* and Eutropius, or obtained the entire passage from a lost source. Alternatively, praefectus praetorio may have disappeared from the text of Eutropius through a medieval scribal error, i.e. the words were available to Festus, but dropped out in a later copy. At first glance Jerome (*ann.* 241–2, p. 217 [Helm]) – whose report parallels Eutropius, but includes praefectus praetorio – seems to confirm this hypothesis. It is possible, however, that Jerome combined Eutropius and Festus: Gordianum admodum adulescens Parthorum natione superata (E) cum victor reverteretur (F) ad patriam, fraude Filippi (EF) praefecti praetorio (F) haut longe a Romano solo interfectus est (E) [cp. Jord. *Rom.* 282]. Therefore, Jerome should not be used to restore praefectus praetorio to the text of Eutropius. In short, Festus probably obtained his account from a lost history (cf. Hartke, p. 56, n. 1).

4. Festus XXIII: Sub Gallieno Mesopotamia inuasa etiam Syriam sibi Persae coeperant uindicare, *nisi quod turpe dictu est*,

Odenathus, *decurio Palmyrenus*, *collecta Syrorum agrestium manu acriter restitisset et fuis aliquotiens Persis non modo nostrum limitem defendisset*, sed etiam ad Ctesiphontem Romani ultor imperii, quod mirum dictu est, penetrasset.

Eutropius 9. 8. 2: . . . Parthi Mesopotamia occupata Syriam sibi coeperant vindicare; 9. 10: . . . in Oriente per Odenathum Persae victi sunt. Defensa Syria recepta Mesopotamia usque ad Ctesiphontem Odenathus penetravit.

Vita Gallieni 10. 1: . . . Odaenathus rex Palmyrenorum obtinuit totius Orientis imperium . . .; 10. 6: Odaenathus autem ad Ctesiphontem Parthorum multitudinem obsedit. . . .

Vitae Tyranni Triginta 15. 1-2: Nisi Odaenathus, princeps Palmyrenorum, capto Valeriano, fessis Romanae rei publicae viribus, sumpsisset imperium, in Oriente perditae res essent. Quare adsumpto nomine primum regali cum uxore Zenobia . . . collecto exercitu contra Persas profectus est; 15. 4: Postremo Ctesiphontem usque Saporem . . . persecutus. . . .

Vita Valeriani 4. 2: Odaenathus Palmyrenus collecto exercitu rem Romanam prope in pristinum statum reddidit.

Festus could not have obtained all his information from an extant history: e.g. 'decurio Palmyrenus' and 'collecta Syrorum agrestium manu'. Moreover, it is unlikely that he supplied these rather specific additions himself. A lost history seems to have been consulted. Jerome *ann.* 266, p. 221 (Helm) probably followed Festus: Odenatus decurio Palmyrenus collecta agrestium manu ita Persas cecidit, ut ad Ctesiphontem castra poneret (cp. Jord. *Rom.* 290). I am not convinced by Hartke's suggestion (p. 57) that the *H.A.* passages were influenced by Festus.

5. Festus XXIV: Ea (Zenobia) enim mortem marito (Odenathus) feminea dicione Orientis tenebat imperium. Quam Aurelianus multis *clibanariorum et sagittariorum milibus fretam apud Immas* haut procul ab Antiochia uicit et captam Romae triumphans ante currum duxit.

Eutropius 9. 13. 2: Zenobiam quoque, quae occiso Odenatho marito Orientem tenebat, haud longe ab Antiochia sine gravi proelio cepit, ingressusque Romam nobilem triumphum quasi receptor Orientis Occidentisque egit praecedentibus currum Tetrico et Zenobia.

Vita Aureliani 25. 2: Pugnatum est . . . contra Zenobiam et Zabam eius socium apud Emesam magno certamine; 34. 3: Incedebat etiam Zenobiam, ornata gemmis, catenis aureis, quas alii sustentabant.

That Immas is not a scribal error is proved by Jordanes *Rom.* 291 (quam Zenobiam . . . apud Hymmas vicino Antiochiae superavit), who probably borrowed from Festus, and Jerome, who may have combined Eutropius and Festus: *ann.* 273 – Zenobia apud Immas haut longe ab Antiochia vincitur (F), quae occiso Odenato marito orientis tenebat imperium (E); *ann.* 274 – Aurelianum Romae triumphantem Tetricius et Zenobia praecesserunt (E). I cannot follow Jacobi's argument (p. 49) that Festus supplied Immas 'e memoria'! On the contrary, he must have consulted a lost history. If this lost history was also the source of Eutropius, then we must assume that Eutropius either rejected or carelessly omitted apud Immas.

6. (a) Festus XXIV: Cari imperatoris uictoria de Persis nimium potens superno numini uisa est. Nam ad inuidiam caelestis indignationis pertinuisse credenda est.

Victor *Caesares* 38. 3–5: Ubi fuis hostibus, dum gloriae inconsulte avidior Thesiphonta urbem Parthiae inclitam transgreditur, fulminis tactu conflagravit. Id quidam iure ei accidisse referunt; nam cum oracula docuissent adusque oppidum memoratum perveniri victoria licere, longus delatus poenas luit. Proinde arduum fatalia devertere, eoque futuri notio superflua.

Vita Cari 8. 2: Dum gloriae inconsulte avidior Thesiphonta urbem Parthiae inclitam transgreditur, fulminis tactu conflagravit; 9. 1: plerique dicunt vim fati quandam esse, ut Romanus princeps Ctesiphontem transire non possit, ideoque Carum fulmine absumptum quod eos fines transgredi cuperet quo fataliter constituti sunt.

The following hypotheses may be put forth to account for the similarities between these passages: (1) Festus, Victor and the *Vita* are derived from the same source; (2) Victor used the *Vita*; (3) the *Vita* used Victor; (4) the *Vita* used Festus; (5) Festus used Victor; (6) Festus used the *Vita*. I think we may reject no. 4 for two reasons: (1) the *Vita* provides a more exten-

sive and precise report than Festus, and, (2) the *Vita* undoubtedly is related, directly or indirectly, to Victor 38. 3. I am not prepared to choose between the remaining hypotheses: one theoretically seems as possible as another.

(b) Festus XXIV: Is enim ingressus Persidam quasi nullo eam obsistente uastauit.

Vita Cari 8. 1: Contra Persas profectus nullo sibi occurrente Mesopotamiam Carus cepit et Ctesiphontem usque pervenit.

Festus may have borrowed from the *Vita*, the *Vita* from Festus, or both from a common source. Since Festus could not have obtained quasi nullo eam obsistente from Victor, the validity of hypothesis no. 5 above is doubtful. Similarly, we may reject no. 3, unless one assumes that the *Vita* combined Victor and Festus. Hartke's analysis (pp. 56-7) of quasi nullo eam obsistente and nullo sibi occurrente is not convincing. He points out that Eutropius 9. 18 (ipsos proelio fudit) and Victor 38. 3 (ubi fuis hostibus) report a battle between Carus and the Persians, while Festus and the *Vita* indicate that he marched through Persian territory unopposed: 'quin etiam Scriptorem Historiae Augustae proelium factum fusosque Persas in fonte non vidisse certum est, cum, si vidisset, nullo occurrente Mesopotamiam captam esse vix dixisset.' From this, he concludes that the author of the *Vita* borrowed from Festus. The converse is equally possible. More convincing is Hohl's analysis (*Klio* 27 [1934], 159-60). Pointing out that nullo sibi occurrente does not preclude an engagement, but only an offensive launched from the Persian side, Hohl suggests that the Kaisergeschichte (Enmann's) reported an easy victory of Carus over the Persians, who at the approach of the Romans fled. In a sense, then, Carus won the proelium nullo sibi occurrente. Festus may have been confused by this account in his source (the Kaisergeschichte?) and 'resolved' the difficulty by adding quasi.

(c) Festus XXIV: Cochen et Ctesiphontem, urbes Persarum nobilissimas, cepit. Cum uictor totius gentis castra supra Tigridem haberet, ui fulminis ictus interiit.

Eutropius 9. 18. 1: Ipsos (Persas) proelio fudit, Cochen et Ctesiphontem, urbes nobilissimas (notissimas, Droysen; family B reads nobilissimas), cepit. Et cum castra supra Tigridem haberet, vi divini fulminis periit.

Cp. Jerome *ann.* 284: Carus Narbonensis cum omni Parthorum regione vastata Cochem et Ctesifontem, nobilissimas hostium urbes, cepisset, super Tigridem castra ponens fulmine ictus interiit; *Epit. de Caes.* 38. 3, Oros. 7. 24. 4, Jord. *Rom.* 294.

Whether Festus used Eutropius or a common source is not certain. The linguistic correspondence between Eutropius and Festus in section II is not easily dismissed and seems to indicate Festus' direct use of Eutropius. However, it is apparent that Festus depended more and more upon another source. Whether this complementary source is Enmann's *Kaisergeschichte* I cannot determine, but certainly this is a possibility. Indeed, Festus' additions vis-à-vis Eutropius might well have been included in a collection of Imperial biographies: e.g. the addition of *qui praefectus praetorio eius erat* in the account of Gordianus' death (ch. XXII); the triumph of Alexander (ch. XXII); the precise location of Aurelian's victory over Zenobia (ch. XXIV). We may conclude only that in section II two sources seem to have been combined: Eutropius and a lost history.

Jacobi (p. 50) and Wölfflin (p. 174) attributed chs. XXV–XXIX to Festus' memory, but Hartke (p. 58) insists that '*nonnulla ex Eutropi breviario fluxerunt*'. Of course, Festus may have recounted some events from memory, but for the report of the battle of Eliensi (ch. XXVII) and for the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine a source was required. That Festus' dependence upon known histories radically decreases in section III is undeniable. Yet, the appearance in section III of parallels with extant histories indicates that Festus had not abandoned his sources entirely. The following passages may have been obtained from or influenced by the histories of Eutropius and Aurelius Victor; the remainder of section III must be attributed to a lost history or to Festus' memory.

1. Festus XXV: Et cum uix impetrasset, ut reparato de limitaneis Daciae exercitu euentum Martis repeteret, in Armenia maiore ipse imperator *cum duobus equitibus* explorauit hostes, et cum uiginti *quinque milibus militum* superueniens castris hostilibus subito innumera Persarum agmina adgressus ad internicionem cecidit.

Eutropius 9. 25. 1: (Maximianus) in Armenia maiore pugna-

vit successu ingenti nec minore consilio, simul fortitudine, quippe qui etiam speculatoris munus cum altero aut tertio equite suscepit.

Victor *Caesares* 39. 34: . . . per Armeniam in hostes contendit. . . .

Since Festus alone records the numerical strength of Maximian's army, at least this portion of ch. XXV must be attributed to a lost source.

2. Festus XXVI: Constantinus rerum dominus extremo uitae suae tempore expeditionem parauit in Persas. Toto enim orbe pacatis gentibus et recenti de Gothis uictoria gloriosior cunctis. . . .

Eutropius 10. 8. 2: Bellum adversus Parthos molens . . . obiit; 10. 7. 1: Nam etiam Gothos post civile bellum varie profligavit pace iis postremum data. . . .

Victor *Caesares* 41. 16: Ita . . . cum totum orbem tredecim tenuisset . . . in Persas tendens . . . excessit . . .; 41. 13: Et interea Gothorum Sarmatarumque stratae gentes. . . .

3. Festus XXVII: Nocturna uero Eliensi prope Singaram pugna, ubi praesens Constantius adfuit, omnium expeditionum compensatus fuisset euentus, si locis et nocte aduersantibus percitos ferocia milites ab intempestiuo pugnandi tempore, imperator ipse adloquendo reuocare potuisset.

Eutropius 10. 10. 1: Nullumque ei contra Saporem prosperum proelium fuit, nisi quod apud Singaram haud dubiam victoriam ferocia militum amisit, qui pugnam seditiose et stolide contra rationem belli die iam praecipiti poposcerunt.

4. Festus XXVIII: Is (Iulianus) enim ingenti apparatu, utpote totius orbis regnator, infesta in Parthos signa commouit. . . .

Eutropius 10. 16. 1: Hinc Iulianus rerum potitus est ingentique apparatu Parthis intulit bellum. . . .

5. Festus XXVIII: Strenuus in ingressu multa Persarum oppida et castella aut suscepit dedita aut manu cepit.

Eutropius 10. 16. 1: Aliquot oppida et castella Persarum in deditionem accepit vel vi expugnauit. . . .

6. Festus XXIX: Tanta reuerentia Romani nominis fuit, ut a Persis prius sermo de pace haberetur ac reduci confectus inedia exercitus sineretur condicionibus (quod nunquam antea accidit) dispendiosis Romanae rei publicae inpositus ut Nisibis et pars Mesopotamiae traderetur. . . .

Eutropius 10. 17. 1-2: Qui (Iovianus) iam turbatis rebus exercitu quoque inopia laborante uno a Persis atque altero proelio victus pacem cum Sapore necessariam quidem, sed ignobilem, fecit multatus finibus ac nonnulla imperii Romani parte tradita. Quod ante eum . . . numquam accidit.

For several rhetorical embellishments Florus seems to have been the model:

(a) Festus XXVIII: Grave . . . res publica uulnus accepit.

Florus 1. 46. 1: Grave volnus . . . populus Romanus accepit.

(b) Festus XXVII: Nimbo sagittarum obruti sunt. . . .

Florus 1. 46. 8: In modum . . . nimborum densa . . . tela fuderunt (cf. 2. 20. 30).

Beginning with ch. XXV, a slight refinement of style may be discerned, which may have resulted from a change in sources. The information down to the reign of Diocletian is presented in a stale, factual style. Thereafter, Festus began to borrow from a more literary source or to paraphrase the spare language of his chronicle-type source. Festus' reliance upon memory could account in part for the stylistic change; yet, as I have indicated, certain portions of section III undoubtedly were influenced by a written source. We may conclude that he borrowed at least some of his information in section III from a 'new' source in addition to Eutropius.

It seems probable that this 'new' source was the continuation of the *Kaisergeschichte* which, according to Enmann (p. 459), Aurelius Victor and Eutropius used 'als Haupt- wenn nicht als einzige Quelle'. Enmann convincingly demonstrated that the continuator compiled biographical sketches of the Emperors from Diocletian to Julian - i.e. from 284 to 357 (the battle of Strassbourg). Festus, therefore, could have obtained his account of the battle of Eliensi and his surveys of the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine from this source.

Festus' extensive account of Julian's Persian campaign requires further comment. Why should Festus include such a lengthy report while Eutropius, an eyewitness, supplies only a brief, factual sketch? The simplest answer is that Festus considered Julian's expedition important to his theme announced in chs. XV–XXIX: to record *quotiens Babyloniae ac Romanorum arma conlata sint et quibus uicibus sagittis pila contenderint* (ch. XV). His source, on the other hand, is more difficult to determine. He may have participated in the campaign and thus could provide details from memory or he may have interviewed participants. It is also possible that a written source was consulted.

Thus, Festus obtained his information for the *Breviarium* through a combination of many sources. For section I he seems to have used Eutropius and Florus together with a lost history; for sections II and III he borrowed from Eutropius and lost histories. I do not believe that he excerpted a single lost history – i.e. which recounted events *ab urbe condita* to A.D. 364 – but several lost histories. For section I Festus drew upon a Republican history – perhaps the lost Epitome of Livy. For section II an Imperial history to the reign of Diocletian was used: possibly Enmann's *Kaisergeschichte*. Then in section III, a new Imperial history was excerpted: perhaps Enmann's 'continuation' of the *Kaisergeschichte*. In short, I believe that Festus used three lost histories, which, together with Florus and Eutropius, provided a continuous narrative.

HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE TEXT

TO RENDER intelligible the sometimes misleading statements found in the *Breviarium*, I have attempted to cite and evaluate all the ancient literary, epigraphic, and numismatic evidence relevant to the subjects discussed by Festus. In addition, I have noted monographs of particular value; a complete bibliography of modern studies for each subject, however, has not been attempted. The first and last chapters of the *Breviarium* contain little historical information – reference to the Gothic victory in ch. XXX has been discussed elsewhere (above, p. 2) – and are not included in the commentary; the remaining chapters are discussed as they appear in the text.

II. H. A. Sanders (*TAPhA* 36 [1905], 5 ff.) proved that Festus could have obtained all the information in this chapter from Eutropius. To delineate the chronological data found in the ancient literary sources Sanders constructed a chart (p. 7); this I have abbreviated and adapted (p. 100) so that Festus' chronology of Roman history may be compared quickly with other chronological schemes available to a writer in A.D. 369/70. Obviously, we cannot test the accuracy of any chronological outline of the regal or early Republican periods; we can only compare the various accounts.

The chronologies of Eutropius and Festus are identical. Thus, since Eutropius seems to have been used elsewhere in the *Breviarium*, we need not postulate a lost source to account for Festus' chronological scheme.

III. Festus repeats and amplifies in another context almost all the information contained in this chapter; each statement will be analysed as it reappears in the narrative. Evidently he inserted this section to provide a chronological framework for the succeeding chapters on the Roman provinces.

One statement in this chapter does require comment: Sub

	Diod.	Diony- sius	Livy	Perio- chae	Chron. of 354	Eutrop.	Festus	Jerome
Romulus	38	37	37		38	37	37	38
Interregnum		1	1			1	1	
Numa	41	43	43		41	43	43 ¹	41
Tullus	33	32	32		32	32	32	32
Ancus	[27] ²	24	24	24	36	24	24	23
Tarquin I	37	38	38	38	28	38	38	37
Servius	44	[44]	44	44	45	[44]	44	34
Tarquin II	24	25	25	25	25	24	24	35
total	244	244	244	255	[245]	243	243 ³	240
Decemvirs	2	3	3	3		2	2	2
Anarchy	1		5	5		4	4	4
Mil. Trib	3		4			3	3	3
Republic						467	467	469
Empire						407	407	
total						1117	1117	

¹ Cf. Augustine, *CD.* 3. 9: quadraginta tres vel, ut alii volunt, triginta et novem anni.

² Numbers in brackets are obtained by combination.

³ Cf. Augustine, *CD.*, 3. 15: per ducentos ferme et quadraginta et tres annos.

regibus septem per annos CCXLIII non amplius quam usque Portum atque Ostiam intra octauum decimum miliarium a portis urbis Romae . . . Romanum processit imperium. With this should be compared Eutropius 1. 8: Ita Romae regnatum est per septem reges annis ducentis quadraginta tribus, cum adhuc Roma, ubi plurimum, vix usque ad quintum decimum miliarium possideret. Festus, of course, is incorrect: Ostia is only fifteen miles from Rome. If Festus obtained his information from Eutropius or from a common source (probably reading quintum decimum), then we must assume either that he mis-copied quintum or that the correct reading, quintum, was altered in the transmission of the *Breviarium* (all MSS read octauum). As with many of Festus' 'errors' (see above, pp. 35 ff.) a choice between these two explanations cannot be made.

IV. PRIMA . . . EST: On 10 March 241, C. Lutatius Catulus (consul 242) brought to an end the First Punic War by defeating the Carthaginian fleet under Hanno at the Aegates islands. Hamilcar then despatched envoys to Catulus to treat for peace.

The conditions imposed by the Romans were severe: Carthage should withdraw from Sicily and the neighbouring islands, should not attempt to overthrow Hiero, should pay an indemnity to Rome, and should return all captives taken during the war (on the treaty: Polyb. 1. 62-3; Liv. 21. 18. 8-10; Nepos *Hamilc.* 1. 5; Appian *Sic.* 2; Auctor *Vir. Ill.* 41; Eutrop. 2. 27; Oros. 4. 11. 2-3; cf. Naev. fr. 48 [Baerhens]; Zon. 8. 17). Aided by his brother, Q. Lutatius Cerco (consul 241), Catulus immediately began the organization of Sicily as a Roman province. It was not until 227, however, that a praetor, C. Flaminius, was assigned Sicily as his province (Solinus 5. 1; *Dig.* 1. 2. 2. 32; cf. Liv. *Per.* 20).

EAM . . . OBTINUIT: This sentence is a fine example of the danger inherent in compression of sources. Hiero II (rex Syracusanorum, not Siculorum) became an ally of Rome in 263 when he concluded a fifteen-year peace with the consul M. Valerius Messala (Polyb. 1. 16. 4-11; Diod. 23. 4. 1; Liv. *Per.* 16; Eutrop. 2. 19; Zon. 8. 9). This amicable relationship endured until Hiero's death in 215; he was succeeded by his grandson, Hieronymus, who was less than sixteen years old (Polyb. 7. 3. 6-7 and 7. 3; Diod. 26. 15. 1; Sil. Ital. 14. 85-90). The praetor Ap. Claudius Pulcher, soon after Hiero's death was announced in Rome, was despatched to renew the treaty with Hieronymus. The young ruler, thinking that Rome could not recover from the recent defeat at Cannae, refused to negotiate (Liv. 24. 6. 4-6; cf. Polyb. 7. 3 and 5). His defection was nullified quickly, however, for he was the victim of conspiracy in 214 (Diod. 26. 15. 2; Liv. 24. 7; Plut. *Marcellus* 13. 1; Sil. Ital. 14. 99-104; Liv. *Per.* 24). Shortly thereafter M. Claudius Marcellus, serving his third term as consul, arrived at Messana. For three years he attempted to pacify the Sicilian countryside and to capture the city of Syracuse; finally, in 211, Syracuse fell (Polyb. 8. 37; Diod. 26. 20; Liv. 25. 23-5. 10; Plut. *Marcellus* 15-18. 4; Vell. 2. 38. 2; Flor. 1. 22. 33-4; Frontin. 3. 3. 2; Sil. Ital. 14. 628-40; Eutrop. 3. 14. 3; Zon. 9. 5). Obviously, Festus has confused Hiero with Hieronymus. Moreover, by extreme compression, he implies that Marcellus defeated Hieronymus - as I have pointed out, Marcellus began his campaign in Sicily after Hieronymus' death. Finally, it is

misleading to say that Marcellus 'obtenuit' Sicily. Sicily, with the exception of Hiero's territory, had become a Roman province in 241; Marcellus' campaign was directed against the Syracusan enclave, whose inhabitants had defected under Hieronymus and his successors.

DEINDE . . . ADMINISTRATUR: We know that Sicily first was governed by a *praetor* (see note above) and at the end of the fourth century A.D. was administered by a *consularis* (Not. Dign. Oc. 1. 60, 19. 6). Festus' rather indefinite statement that Sicily 'postea (i.e. at some date after 241 B.C.) est commissa praesidibus' requires comment. Before the reign of Diocletian the term *praeses* could designate any provincial governor, but after Constantine *praeses* denoted the lowest rank of provincial governors (see A. H. M. Jones *JRS* 44 [1954], 24). Since we know (Jones, *idem*) that Sicily was governed by a *corrector* from the reign of Diocletian, and later by a *consularis* – both grades above the *praeses* in the fourth century – it seems unlikely that Festus, who must have been familiar with the various provincial grades, used the term *praeses* in its post-Constantine sense. We may conclude that Festus merely indicates that Sicily was entrusted to a *praeses* (i.e. a governor), in place of a *praetor*, at some date between 241 B.C. and the reign of Diocletian.

SARDINIAM . . . SARDI: It is difficult to understand why Festus attached any significance to the Sardinian campaign of M. Caecilius Metellus (consul 115), whose triumph took place more than a century after the annexation of Sardinia (the date of annexation is variously reported: in 241, together with Sicily – Liv. 22. 44. 11, 21. 40. 3, 21. 1. 5; Ampelius 46. 2; Auctor *Vir. Ill.* 41; Oros. 4. 11. 2; in 238 – Fest. 430L; Zon. 8. 18; in 237 – Eutrop. 3. 2. 2; without a date specified – Polyb. 1. 88. 8–12; Liv. *Per.* 20; for a discussion of the evidence see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, I [1957], 149–50). Very little is known of his activities in Sardinia during his three terms as *proconsul* – only that he celebrated in 111 a triumph ex Sardinia (Degrassi, pp. 84–5; Vell. 2. 8. 2; Eutrop. 4. 25. 1). E. Pais (*Storia della Sardegna* [1923], 93) suggested that the triumph had been introduced into the historical tradition originally, 'non tanto per l'importanza delle gesta, quanto per la rarissima circostanza che nello stesso giorno C. Caecilio,

fratello del vincitore dei Sardi, trionfava del pari sui Traci.' This seems to me the most probable explanation. On the other hand, since the triumphal Fasti are not complete, it is possible that Festus refers to another Metellus who celebrated such a triumph earlier.

IUNCTA . . . REGUNTUR: Sardinia and Corsica were governed as a single province from 227 B.C. (see note above) until A.D. 319. In the latter year (perhaps earlier) the islands were administered separately – i.e. a *praeses* was assigned to each (see P. Meloni, *L'amministrazione della Sardegna da Augusto all' Invasione Vandalica* [1958], 69 ff.). Nunc singulae a praesidibus reguntur correctly indicates that the administration was still divided in 369/70.

TER . . . AGIT: Carthage was destroyed in 146 by Scipio, who was then commissioned by the senate to organize the new territory as a province (Vell. 2. 32. 2; Appian *Lib.* 135; Liv. *Per.* 51), which was placed under a *praetor* (Appian *loc. cit.*). From the reign of Augustus Africa was governed by a *proconsul*; nunc sub proconsulibus correctly indicates that Africa was still proconsular in 369/70.

NUMIDIA . . . PERUENIT: The friendly kings referred to are Massinissa (who became an ally of Rome in 206 and ruled until 148) and his successor, Micipsa. Micipsa's death in 118 precipitated a struggle for power between Jugurtha – Massinissa's grandson, whom Micipsa had adopted and reared – and Micipsa's sons, Adherbal and Hiempsal. Hiempsal was murdered by Jugurtha's henchmen (Sallust *Iug.* 12), and Adherbal in 112 was besieged, captured and put to death at Cirta (Sallust *Iug.* 26; Liv. *Per.* 64). Festus' specific statement that the Romans formally declared war (*bellum indictum*) on Jugurtha 'ob necatos Adherbalem et Hiempsalem' reproduces the Livian account of the cause of the war (cf. Liv. *Per.* 64; Eutrop. 4. 26. 1). S. I. Oost (*AJPh* 75 [1954], 147 ff.) has argued that this account is correct – that the murder of Hiempsal and Adherbal, amici et socii, provided the legal justification for Roman initiation of hostilities. In short, the war was *iustum* – i.e. war was formally declared in accordance with fetial procedure. It is difficult to believe, however, that the true cause of the war was the Roman determination to bring a murderer to justice. Other

explanations – that the Romans feared the creation of a hostile African state under Jugurtha or that the Equites exerted pressure on the Senate to avenge the Italici massacred at Cirta (Sallust *Iug.* 26) – seem more probable.

In 109, after two years of unproductive military operations in Africa, the consul Q. Caecilius Metellus assumed command of the Roman armies and achieved some notable successes. In 107, however, he was replaced by the consul C. Marius, who spent the next year preparing for a major assault on Jugurtha's strongholds. Late in the campaigning season of 106 Marius inflicted a major defeat on Jugurtha and his new ally, King Bocchus of Mauritania. Bocchus then deserted Jugurtha and began to negotiate a truce with the Romans. In 105, after much hesitation, Bocchus agreed to arrange the capture of Jugurtha in exchange for the *amicitiam, foedus, Numidiae partum quam nunc peteret*. Thus, Jugurtha was bound over to Sulla, who took him to Marius (on Metellus – Sallust *Iug.* 43–83; Vell. 2. 11. 2; Flor. 1. 36. 11; Liv. *Per.* 65; Eutrop. 4. 27. 3; on Marius – Sallust *Iug.* 83–113; Diod. 36. 1; Flor. 1. 36. 14; Oros. 5. 15. 8–10, 15 and 17; on negotiations with Bocchus and the capture of Jugurtha – Sallust *Iug.* 102. 2–113. 6; Vell. 2. 12. 1; Dio 26, fr. 89. 5; Plut. *Sulla* 3. 1–3 [cp. *Marius* 10. 3–4]; Appian *Num.* 4–5; Flor. 1. 36. 17; Eutrop. 4. 27. 4; Oros. 5. 15. 18). Festus' statement that in *populi Romani potestatem Numidia peruenit* is rather misleading, for native monarchs continued to govern Numidia until 46 B.C. At that time Caesar appointed C. Sallustius Crispus as proconsul in the Numidian territory, which was renamed Africa Nova (*Bell. Afric.* 97. 1; Appian *BC* 2. 100; Dio 43. 9. 2).

MAURITANIAE . . . SUNT: Bocchus II, King of Mauretania, died in 33 B.C. The subsequent disposition of the Mauretanian territory is obscure in our sources. Dio offers two conflicting accounts: that the kingdom was enrolled immediately (i.e. in 33) as a province (49. 43. 7) and, alternatively, that Juba II was invested with the kingdoms of Bocchus and Bogud (co-regents from 50–38) in 25 B.C. The latter report is confirmed by Strabo (17. 3. 7, 828C). Festus does not state that Mauretania was made a province in 33, but merely that the territory was obtained from Bocchus; in short, he does not provide any

information concerning the status of Mauretania between 33 and 25 B.C.

SED . . . CONSCIUIT: In 49 B.C. King Juba I of Numidia, an ally of Pompeius, defeated the Caesarian army under C. Scribonius Curio in the Bagradas valley (Caes. *BC* 1. 30. 2, 2. 23–44, 3. 10. 5; *Bell. Afr.* 19. 2; Lucan 4. 581–824; Appian *BC* 2. 44–6; Dio 41. 41. 1–42. 7, 42. 56. 2; Liv. *Per.* 110). As a result of this victory Africa was secured as a Pompeian possession for the next three years. In 46, however, Caesar defeated the Pompeian army at Thapsus; rather than surrender Juba I committed suicide (*Bell. Afr.* 94; Seneca *De prov.* 2; Appian *BC* 2. 100; Flor. 2. 13. 69; Dio 43. 8. 4; Liv. *Per.* 114; Eutrop. 6. 23. 1–2; Oros. 6. 16. 4; Jord. *Rom.* 211). Festus' account is substantially correct, but the statement that Juba I was defeated by Augustus – supported by the best MSS – instead of Julius Caesar is a chronological error.

ITA . . . COEPERUNT: Evidently Festus is referring to the reinstatement of Bocchus II and Bogud following the defeat of the Pompeians at Thapsus. Mauretania remained under these rulers, φίλοι 'Ρωμαίων, until 33 B.C. (see previous note) and was not annexed as a province until shortly before A.D. 44 (Pliny *HN* 5. 1. 1; Dio 60. 9. 5).

PER . . . PRAESIDALES: The accuracy of Festus' provincial list for Africa is demonstrated below in the Appendix. In addition, the governmental status attributed to each province by Festus is supported by other evidence. A *proconsul* governed Africa (see note above); throughout the fourth century a *praeses* administered Mauretania Caesariensis and Mauretania Sitifensis (evidence in Pallu de Lessert, *Fastes des provinces Africaines* II [1901], 341 ff., 355 ff.); Byzacium was under a *praeses* in 321 (*CIL* VI, 1687), but had become consular by 363 (*CTh.* 11. 20. 1 dated 12 November 363; cf. *Cod. Iust.* 1. 33. 1 dated 27 December 368); Numidia became consular in 320 (Pallu de Lessert, 38). The status of Tripolis (Tripolitana) in 369/70, however, is not clear. According to Ammianus (28. 6. 11, 28. 6. 22), Ruricius was *praeses* of Tripolis in 364. Yet, in a rescript to the *proconsul* of Africa on 30 May 372 (*CTh.* 7. 7. 12), Tripolis is consular: per consulares Byzacenam et Tripolitanam provincias. Since Festus reports that Tripolis was governed by a

praeses in 369/70, we may conclude that the titular change occurred between 369/70 and 372.

V. HISPANIS . . . TULIMUS: P. Cornelius Scipio (cos. 218), having received Spain as his province, attempted to intercept Hannibal and the Carthaginian army at the Rhône. Hannibal, however, crossed before Scipio arrived. The consul, delegating to his brother Cn. Cornelius Scipio (Calvus) the command in Spain, returned to Italy. Before going into winter quarters at Tarraco, Cn. reduced the coastal towns as far as the Ebro and inflicted a major defeat on Hanno near Cissa (Polyb. 3. 49. 4, 3. 76; Liv. 21. 32. 3-4, 60. 4, 60. 6-9; Appian *Ib.* 14; Zon. 8. 25). I have taken Festus at his word – that he refers specifically to the ‘first’ Roman military action in Spain (i.e. under Publius and Gnaeus in 218). It is possible, however, that the ‘first’ should not be read literally – Festus may have had in mind the later and certainly better known expedition under P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus (210 B.C.).

REBELLANTES . . . PERUENIMUS: D. Junius Brutus (Callaicus), consul in 138 B.C., combatted the Lusitanians as far as the Douro (Vell. 2. 5. 1; Appian *Ib.* 71; Flor. 1. 33. 12; Liv. *Per.* 55; Eutrop. 4. 19. 1). While Festus may have obtained his statement ad Oceanum mare peruenimus from Flor. 1. 33. 12 (peragratoque victor Oceani litore), Liv. *Per.* 55 (usque ad Oceanum perdomuit; cp. Jerome *ann.* 142, p. 144 [Helm]), or a common source, it is difficult to account for usque Gadis – we have no evidence that Brutus campaigned in southern Spain in 138. The most probable explanation is that either Festus or a scribe has written Gadis for Cales, the port at the mouth of the Douro. Brutus was not the first Roman commander to campaign against the Lusitanians, for L. Postumius Albinus triumphed ex Lusitania Hispaniaque in 178 (Degrassi, pp. 80-1; Liv. *Per.* 41).

POSTEA . . . UICIT: I have discussed this passage above, p. 37.

CELTIBERI . . . SUNT: Festus’ statement that the Celtiberi often rebelled is rather less dramatic than the facts. From 195 until 133 B.C. the Romans were challenged repeatedly and often defeated by this tribe. Not until 133, after three major campaigns (181-179, 153-151, 143-133), did the Romans under Scipio

succeed in destroying Numantia, the unifying centre of the resistance (on the campaign of Scipio and the capture of the city – Flor. 1. 34. 8–17; Appian *Ib.* 84–98; Polyæn. 8. 16. 1–5; Liv. *Per.* 57 and 59; Eutrop. 4. 17. 2; Jerome *ann.* 142, p. 144 [Helm]; Oros. 5. 7. 5–18; for a discussion of the evidence see A. Schulten, *Numantia* I [1914], 366–75).

OMNES . . . SUNT: The conflict between Rome and Q. Sertorius, a Marian sympathizer who had taken refuge with the Lusitani in Spain, began in 80 B.C. with the defeat of the Romans *terra marique*. In the next year an army under Q. Caecilius Metellus was sent to Spain, but this proved ineffective against the combined guerrilla activities of Sertorius and the Spanish tribes. In 77, both armies were reinforced: Sertorius by M. Perperna Vento and Metellus by Cn. Pompeius. Finally, in 73 or 72, Sertorius was assassinated by subordinates under the direction of his erstwhile colleague, Perperna. Shortly thereafter, Cn. Pompeius defeated and executed Perperna, thus dissolving the resistance to Roman rule in Spain (on the death of Sertorius and the defeat of Perperna – Diod. 37. 22a; Vell. 2. 30. 1; Plut. *Sertorius* 26–7, *Pomp.* 20. 2–4; Flor. 2. 10. 9; Appian *BC* 1. 113–15, *Ib.* 101; Liv. *Per.* 96; Jul. Exsuper. 8; Oros. 5. 23. 13; see the recent discussion by W. H. Bennett, *Historia* 10, 4 [1961], 459 ff.). Festus may have obtained his report from Eutropius (6. 1. 3): Octavo demum anno per suos occisus est, et finis ei bello datus per Cn. Pompeius adulescentem et Q. Metellum Pium atque omnes prope Hispaniae in dicionem populi Romani redactae.

POSTEA . . . SUNT: Under the Lex Trebonia of 55 B.C. Pompeius and Crassus received provinces and commands for a five-year period: Pompeius was given Spain, Crassus Syria. Under the Lex Licinia Pompeia of the same year Caesar was confirmed in his command of Gaul and Illyricum (Vell. 2. 46. 2; Plut. *Pomp.* 52. 3 [adds *Λιβύην ἅπασαν* to Pompeius' command], *Crass.* 15; Dio 39. 33. 2–3; Liv. *Per.* 105). Pompeius, however, did not set out for Spain, but despatched L. Afranius and M. Petreius to govern as legates in his absence. In 52, Pompeius' command was prorogued for another five years (Plut. *Pomp.* 55. 7 [four years], *Caes.* 28. 5; Appian *BC* 2. 24; Dio 40. 56 [five years]). Plutarch (*Caes.* 28. 5) explicitly states

that Pompeius governed Spain (and *Λιβύην σύμπασαν*) through legates, and we know that Afranius and Petrcius were still in Spain in 49 B.C. (Caesar *BC* 1. 38; Vell. 2. 50. 4; Liv. *Per.* 110). Since there is no evidence that Pompeius even visited Spain during the five or six years of his tenure, it is difficult to understand Festus' statement that the Spanish provinces a Pompeio perdomitae sunt.

AD EXTREMUM . . . SUNT: In 26 B.C. Augustus personally directed the campaign against the Cantabri and Astures. The following year he was forced to remain in Tarraco because of illness and the campaign was entrusted to his legates – in Lusitania, P. Carisius; in Hispania Citerior, C. Antistius Vetus. In 24, Augustus returned to Rome, and the Temple of Janus was closed. The Cantabri and Astures, however, were not defeated and quickly revolted. Not until 19 B.C. did the Romans, under Agrippa, succeed in pacifying these tribes (the campaigns of 26/5: Flor. 2. 33; Dio 53. 25. 5–8; Oros 6. 21; of 24/19 – Flor. 2. 33; Dio 53. 29. 1–54. 11. 7; Oros 6. 21; for modern discussions of the evidence see R. Syme, *AJP* 55 [1934], 293 ff., A. Schulten, *Los Cantabros y Astures* [1943], and most recently, W. Schmitthenner, *Historia* 11, 1 [1962], 29 ff.).

AC . . . PRAESIDALES: The accuracy of Festus' list for Spain is discussed in the Appendix. According to Not. Dign., Tarraconensis (*Oc.* 1. 102, 21. 12), Carthaginensis (*Oc.* 1. 103, 21. 13), and Tingitana Mauretania ('Tingitania' *Oc.* 1. 104, 3. 12, 21. 14) were governed by a *praeses*, Baetica (*Oc.* 1. 65, 21. 8), Lusitania (*Oc.* 1. 66, 21. 9), and Gallaecia (*Oc.* 1. 67, 21. 10) were consular. This apparent conflict vis-à-vis the status of Gallaecia, under a *praeses* according to Festus, may be nothing more than an administrative alteration subsequent to 369/70.

VI. CUM GALLIS . . . REPORTAUIT: In 390 B.C. the Gauls defeated the Romans on the Allia river (Diod. 14. 114. 2–115. 1; Liv. 5. 37. 6–8; Plut. *Cam.* 18. 6. 7; *Vir. Ill.* 23. 7), entered Rome and besieged the Capitoline to which the citizens had fled, but withdrew after receiving 1000 pounds of gold from the Roman magistrates (Diod. 14. 115. 3–7; Strabo 5. 3; Liv. 5. 48. 8–9; Suet. *Tib.* 32; Plut. *Cam.* 28. 1–4; cp. Justin 28. 2. 4; Servius *ad Aen.* 6. 825). The payment of the gold, however, is not found

in Polybius (2. 18. 2), who attributes the withdrawal to an invasion of their own country by the Veneti. The author of the *Viris Illustribus* (23. 8) says that the siege was lifted 'Camilli virtute', who 'collectis reliquiis' defeated the Gauls. According to the Livian tradition, Camillus, who had been living at Ardea in exile, was created Dictator in the emergency. He then followed the retreating Gauls, defeated them, and recovered the gold (on the exile – Liv. 5. 43. 6; Plut. *Cam.* 23. 2; *Vir. Ill.* 23. 9; Serv. *ad Aen.* 6. 825; on the victory of Camillus – Diod. 14. 117. 5; Liv. 5. 49. 6–7; *Vir. Ill.* 23. 9; Serv. *ad Aen.* 6. 825). Several variations of this story, which is not found at all in Polybius, exist. Plutarch (*Cam.* 29. 1–5) reports that Camillus intervened in Rome before the gold was handed over to the Gauls and sent them away without payment. He then defeated them in a battle eight miles from Rome along the Via Gabinia. Strabo (5. 3) reports that the gold which the Gauls had received from the Romans was stolen from the Gauls on their withdrawal by the Sabini. Festus seems to have followed the traditional Livian account of the events of 390 B.C. and may have obtained his information from Eutropius 1. 20. 2–3 or from a common source (the Epitome of Livy?).

CUM GALLIS . . . PUGNAUIT: Festus' brevity and basic lack of interest in Republican history are clearly revealed in this passage. Rather than discuss the Roman encounters with the Gauls between 390 and 102 B.C., he merely comments: cum Gallis multi consules praetores ac dictatores euentu uario conflixerunt. In his fourth term as consul (102 B.C.) C. Marius crossed the Alps to meet the united German tribes, who threatened to invade Italy in force. After a brief skirmish on the Rhône, Marius engaged the Ambrones and Teutones near Aquae Sextiae (modern Aix) and soundly defeated them. By this action Gallia Narbonensis was secured against attack (*CIL* 1.² 1. p. 195; Vell. 2. 12. 4; Plut. *Marius* 15. 1–21. 2; Frontin. 1. 2. 6, 2. 4. 6; Liv. *Per.* 68; *Vir. Ill.* 67. 2; Jerome *ann.* 102, p. 148 [Helm]; Oros. 5. 16. 9–13). In the following year, Marius and his colleague, Q. Lutatius Catulus, defeated the Cimbri near Vercellae (*CIL* 1.² 1. p. 195; Vell. 2. 12. 5; Plut. *Marius* 25. 3–27. 3; Flor. 1. 38. 14–18; Liv. *Per.* 68; *Vir. Ill.* 67. 2; Eutrop. 5. 2. 1–2; Jerome *ann.* 101, p. 148–9 [Helm]; Oros.

5. 16. 14-22). Festus either did not know that two separate battles had been fought or merely fused the two for the sake of brevity.

C. CAESAR . . . FECIT: This single sentence is perhaps Festus' finest piece of abbreviation; every clause headlines a significant event in Caesar's Gallic campaign. The notations are surprisingly accurate. Although Caesar did not set out in 58 B.C. with ten legions, he did increase the number to ten in 53 by borrowing one from Pompeius and raising two himself (Caesar *BG* 6. 1. 2-4 and 44. 3; Plut. *Caes.* 25. 1, *Pomp.* 52. 3 says that Pompeius sent two legions). On quae terna . . . habuerunt see above, pp. 78 f. Caesar made two attacks on the barbarians across the Rhine. In 55 B.C. he constructed a bridge over the Rhine in order to punish the Sagumbri, who had been raiding along the frontier (Caesar *BC* 4. 18. 1-2; Plut. *Caes.* 22. 4-23. 1, *Cat. Min.* 51. 1-4, *Comp. Nic. et Crass.* 4. 3; Suet. *Jul.* 25; Flor. 1. 45. 14-15; Appian *Celt.* 1. 4. and 18; Dio 39. 48. 4-5; Liv. *Per.* 105; Jerome *ann.* 55, p. 155 [Helm]; Oros. 6. 9. 1). Again in 53, he bridged the Rhine to threaten the allies of Ambiorix (Caes. *BG* 6. 9. 1-5; Flor. 1. 45. 15; Dio 40. 32. 1-3; Liv. *Per.* 107; Oros. 6. 10. 17-18). In 55 and 54 Caesar crossed over to Britain, subdued some of the southern tribes, and secured the pledge of tribute from Cassivellaunus, King of the Trinovantes (*BG* 5. 22. 3-4; Cic. *Att.* 4. 18. 5; Strabo 4. 3. 200C says that heavy duties rather than tribute were levied; Plut. *Caes.* 23. 2; Suet. *Jul.* 25; Polyæn. 8. 23. 5; Dio 40. 3. 2; Eutrop. 6. 17. 3 eosque . . . stipendiarios fecit). This tribute was exacted in 54 - whether it was ever paid is not known - and not in the tenth year (i.e. 51/50) as Festus reports. On the other hand, Caesar evidently did not impose tribute on the Gallic tribes until the conquest was complete in 50 B.C. (Suet. *Jul.* 25; Dio 40. 43. 3).

SUNT IN . . . BRITANNIA SECUNDA: The accuracy of Festus' lists for Gaul and Britain is assessed in the Appendix.

VII. LAEVIUS . . . CIVITATES: According to Livy (26. 24. 15 and 26. 3; cp. Polyb. 9. 39. 2), M. Valerius Laevinus in 211 captured a number of cities and islands in the Ionian Sea (e.g. Zacynthus and Anticyra). Festus could have obtained most of

his account from Florus 1. 23. 6: *primum igitur Laevino consule populus Romanus Ionium mare ingressus tota Graeciae litora veluti triumphanti classe peragravit. Jacobi (De Festi Breviarii fontibus, p. 27) suggested that 'cum (Festus) verba "mare Hadriaticum" et "maritimas obtinuit civitates" addat, bellum Macedonicum primum cum Illyrico bello confundit.'* Whether this confusion should be attributed to Festus or his source cannot be determined.

CRETA . . . FACTA EST: Crete and Cilicia were the traditional seats of piratical activities in the ancient world. In 74 B.C. M. Antonius was granted *imperium* (*infinitem*?) to combat piracy in the Mediterranean. In 72/1 he attacked, was severely defeated, and was forced to agree to a treaty (on the defeat – Appian *Sic.* 6. 1; cp. Sallust *Hist.* 3. 9M; on the forced treaty – Diod. 40. 1). Q. Caecilius Metellus took up the command against the Cretan pirates in 69 B.C., was active in the area during the next few years, and in 67 carried through the organization of Crete as a Roman province (Appian *Sic.* 6. 2; Dio 36. 19. 3; Justin 39. 5. 3; Liv. *Per.* 100; Eutrop. 6. 11. 1). In 62 he triumphed and was awarded the cognomen *Creticus* (Degrassi, pp. 84–5; Vell. 2. 40. 5; Ascon. 14. 56; Flor. 1. 42. 6; Appian *Sic.* 6. 2; Dio 36. 17a, 36. 19. 3; Eutrop. 6. 11. 1).

ATHENIENSES . . . PETIUERUNT: In this sentence Festus reproduces in abbreviated form the Livian-annalistic account of the cause of the Second Macedonian War. The Athenian appeals for aid against Philip V are recorded by Livy, Appian, and Pausanias, but not by Polybius. Livy's account is somewhat confusing: Rome renewed the war against Philip after hearing the *preces Atheniensium*, quos [Philip] agro pervastato in urbem compulerat (31. 1. 9–10); a 'nova legatio' from the Athenians came to Rome seeking assistance and received the promise that *cum consules provincias sortiti essent atque is consul, cui Macedonia provincia evenisset, ad populum tulisset, ut Philippo, regi Macedonum, indiceretur bellum* (31. 5. 5–9); the Acarnanians with Macedonian aid invaded Attica and then returned home – *et irritatio quidem animorum ea prima fuit; postea iustum bellum decretis civitatis ultro indicendo factum* (31. 14. 9–10); after the comitia had voted for war, legates from Ptolemy of Egypt arrived asking whether Romans

would defend the Athenians, their 'communes socii', or should he – the Romans replied that they would provide whatever was necessary (31. 9). Appian (*Maced.* 4. 2) reports that Philip ravaged Attica and besieged Athens; the Athenians, after the Rhodians, sent an embassy to Rome complaining of Philip's actions. According to Polybius (16. 24. 3) an embassy from the Rhodians, who were alarmed by Philip's alliance with Antiochus of Syria, arrived in Rome in the autumn of 201. Pausanias (1. 36. 6), who evidently obtained the information from a monument, reports that the Athenians under Cephisodorus, having failed to secure reinforcements from their allies (Egypt, Mysia, Crete), sailed to Italy and asked aid from the Romans.

During the past fifty years a great many scholars have attempted to discover in these accounts some order and consistency. M. Holleaux ('*Etudes d'histoire hellénistique XI. Le prétendu recours des Athéniens aux Romains en 201/200*', *REA* 22 [1920], 77 ff.) first attempted to disprove the existence of an Athenian appeal to Rome before the passage of the war decree by the comitia. Rejecting the appearance of the Athenians in the list of Roman adscripti at the Peace of Phoenice in 205 (Liv. 29. 12. 14), he cited the slight reception given the legates by the Athenian Assembly (Polyb. 16. 25 ff.) and concluded that 'le prétendu recours des Athéniens aux Romains est un fait controuvé' (p. 92). J. A. O. Larsen (*CPh* 32 [1937], 24–5) argued that the three accounts in Livy (31. 1. 9–10, 31. 5. 5–6, 31. 14. 2–3) all refer to the same embassy – that under Cephisodorus, as reported by Pausanias, which was met by P. Sulpicius (Liv. 31. 14. 2–3) and arrived in Rome after the declaration of war against Philip in 200. Larsen's analysis is rejected in part by McDonald and Walbank (*JRS* 27 [1937], 200–3), who accept Livy 31. 9 as a true account, to be dated after the war vote in 200. F. W. Walbank (*Philip V.* [1940], 311–12) offers the following chronology: the sacrilege by Acarnanians at Eleusinian mysteries in August–September 201 (Liv. 31. 14. 6–9), the Acarnanian request for auxilia from Philip in 200 (Liv. 31. 14. 9), the arrival of the Athenian legates under Cephisodorus in late summer of 200, after the war vote was passed (Paus. 1. 36. 6). E. Bickermann (*RPh*, sér. 3, 9 [1935], 59 ff., 161 ff.), however, accepts the list of adscripti at Phoenice as reported by Livy

and dates the Athenian embassy to the winter of 201/200. In this, he has been followed by J. P. V. D. Balsdon (*JRS* 44 [1954], 32 ff.).

That an Athenian embassy – probably under Cephisodorus – was despatched to Rome to complain against Philip's activities may be accepted. The evidence, however, seems to indicate that the embassy arrived in Rome late in the summer of 200, after the war vote had been passed. In short, the Athenian appeal did not precipitate the Second Macedonian War. Festus, following the Livian tradition, may have borrowed his account from Florus 1. 23. 4–5 (*crevit implorantibus Athenis auxilium contra regis [Philippi] iniurias, cum ille ultra ius victoriae in templa et aras et sepulchra ipsa saevieret. Placuit senatui opem tantis ferre supplicibus*) or a common source (the Epitome of Livy?).

LIBERA . . . ACHAIA FUT: The 'freedom' to which Festus refers was that bestowed by T. Quinctius Flamininus, acting for the Roman Senate, at the Isthmian Games in 196 (after Rome had defeated Philip V at Cynoscephalae). The principal sources, followed by many later historians, are Polybius 18. 46. 5 and Livy 33. 32. 5. The *amicitia* enjoyed by the Greeks was tenuous and did not preclude interference by the Romans. A formal treaty between Rome and Achaia was signed in 196 (Larsen, *CPh* 30 [1935], 202) or in 192–191 (E. Badian, *JRS* 42 [1952], 76 ff.).

AD EXTREMUM . . . OBTENTA EST: In 148 Q. Caecilius Metellus, who had just captured Andriscus, diverted the Roman embassy en route to Asia so that they might settle a dispute between the Achaean League and the Spartans. The legates were instructed to detach certain important towns, formerly under the influence of Philip, from the Achaean League. This Roman interference in the affairs of the League was resisted eagerly, and the legates returned to Rome to report the affront (Polyb. 38. 9. 1; Paus. 7. 14. 1–2; Dio 21. fr. 72. 1–2; Liv. *Per.* 51). The League then despatched an embassy under Thearidas to put their objections in Rome, but these turned back after meeting Sextus Julius Caesar, whom the senate had sent out to administer a mild censure. Upon arriving at Tegea, Sextus and the Roman legates were refused a hearing by the

League and were put off until the next sitting, which was scheduled for six months later (Polyb. 38. 9-11; Paus. 77. 14. 3-5; Dio 21. fr. 72. 2). When the League held its meeting (in 147?), Metellus sent as legates Cn. Papirius, Popilius Laenas, Aulus Gabinius and C. Fannius, who were shouted down and escorted from the meeting (Polyb. 38. 12. 1-4; Flor. 1. 32. 2). Finally, in 146 Metellus engaged and defeated the Achaeans and their allies at Scarpheia and Chaeroneia, after which he advanced to the Isthmus. There he was replaced by L. Mummius, who destroyed the Achaean army at the Isthmus and sacked Corinth (*CIL* 1². 2. 626; Strabo 8. 6. 23, 381C; Vell. 1. 13. 1; Paus. 7. 16. 1-7; *Vir. Ill.* 60. 1; Liv. *Per.* 52; Eutrop. 4. 14. 1; Oros. 5. 3. 5-7). Afterwards, the familiar ten commissioners settled the affairs of Greece in six months, and Achaia became a Roman province (Polyb. 39. 3. 3-5. 1; Strabo 8. 6. 23, 381C; Cic. *Verr.* 2. 1. 55; Paus. 77. 16. 10; Liv. *Per.* 52). The sources are in general agreement that the violation of the legates, whether physical or not, brought about Roman retaliation. From any of these Festus could have obtained his information.

EPIROTAE . . . ACCESSERUNT: L. Aemilius Paullus defeated Perseus of Macedonia at Pydna in 169 B.C., settled Macedonia and the Greek Leagues, and seized seventy Epirote towns and cities on his return to Rome (Polyb. 30. 15 = Strabo 7. 7. 3, 322C; Liv. 45. 34. 1-6; Pliny *H.N.* 4. 39; Plut. *Aem.* 29. 3; Val. Max. 4. 3. 8; Appian *Illyr.* 9; Eutrop. 4. 8. 1).

MACEDONIA . . . ADIUNCTA EST: T. Quinctius Flamininus defeated Philip V at Cynoscephalae in 197 (Polyb. 18. 21-6; Liv. 33. 7-10; Plut. *Flam.* 8; Flor. 1. 23. 11-12; Justin. 30. 4. 12-16; Oros. 4. 20. 5-6), L. Aemilius Paullus overcame Perseus at Pydna in 168 (Liv. 44. 41-2; Vell. 1. 9. 4; Plut. *Aem.* 16. 3-22. 4; Eutrop. 4. 7. 1; Oros. 4. 20. 39; Zon. 9. 23), and Q. Caecilius Metellus defeated Andriscus or Pseudophilip in 148 (Vell. 1. 11. 1-2; Flor. 1. 30. 5; Paus. 7. 13. 1; Porphyry. 7. 4. 13 in *FHG* 3. 702; Ampelius 16. 5; Liv. *Per.* 50; *Vir. Ill.* 61. 1; Eutrop. 4. 13; Jerome *ann.* 150, p. 143 [Helm]; Zon. 9. 28). The construction and content in Ampelius 44 are almost identical with this sentence in Festus: *Populus Romanus cum Macedonibus bellum ter gessit. Sub Flaminino consule regem eorum Philippum vicit,*

sub Paulo Persen Philippi filium, sub Metello Macedonico Pseudophilippum. Since evidence that Festus elsewhere used Ampelius as a source does not exist, we may account for this similarity in several ways: either the purpose and method of the two authors were so similar that an almost identical sentence could be produced independently, or both Festus and Ampelius relied upon a common source.

ILLYRIOS . . . ACCEPIMUS: Ex eadem occasione refers not to Metellus' defeat of Pseudophilip, but to the victory of Paullus at Pydna in 168. In that year L. Anicius Gallus, praetor peregrinus, succeeded Cl. Centho in Illyria, destroyed the fleet of Gentius, defeated him in Scodra, and forced him to surrender (Liv. 44. 30. 12-32. 5; Flor. 1. 28. 2; Appian *Illyr.* 9; Eutrop. 4. 6. 4; Zon. 9. 24). In the following year Anicius served as propraeor in Illyria and completed the organization of the territory as a Roman province (Liv. 45. 3. 1, 16. 2, 26. 1-15; Flor. 1. 28. 2; Eutrop. 4. 6. 4).

DARDANOS . . . PERUENIT: C. Scribonius Curio, serving as proconsul in Macedonia in 75 B.C., campaigned against the Dardani and penetrated to the Danube (Sallust *Hist.* 2. 80M; Flor. 1. 39. 6; Frontin. 4. 1. 43; Liv. *Per.* 92 and 95; Eutrop. 6. 2. 2; Oros. 5. 23. 20). For a discussion of the source(s) used by Festus see above, pp. 79 ff.

SUB . . . ACCESSERUNT: The kingdom of Noricum was incorporated peacefully into the Roman Empire by P. Silius Nerva, governor of Illyricum, in 16 B.C. or soon after (*Mon. Ancyrr.* 26. 3; Suet. *Nero* 18; Flor. 2. 22; Pliny *HN* 3. 136-8; Dio 54. 20. 2; Jord. *Rom.* 241). The first known procurator of the new province was T. Baebius Atticus, 'procurator Ti. Claudii Caesaris. Aug. Germanici in Norico' (*CIL* V, 1838; cf. 1839; see M. Pavan, *Athenaeum* 34 [1956], 58 ff.).

BATHONE . . . UENERUNT: In A.D. 6 the Dalmatians under Bato [*τινος Δησιδιάτου*] revolted; at the same time the Breucians, a Pannonian tribe, elected another Bato as chief and marched against Sirmium. After learning that these two had joined forces, Augustus in A.D. 7 despatched Tiberius and later Germanicus to put down the revolt. Their task was made easier by friction between the two leaders, which resulted in the murder

of Bato the Pannonian; after this the Breucians defected and were conquered by a Roman army under M. Plautius Silvanus. Bato the Dalmatian withdrew from Pannonia and subsequently surrendered in A.D. 8 (Vell. 2. 110-16; Suet. *Tib.* 20; Dio 55. 29. 2-33. 2, 34. 4-7, 56. 11-17; Jord. *Rom.* 216; for a discussion of the evidence see E. Koestermann, *Hermes* 81 [1953], 345 ff.). Festus, out of ignorance or by design, has emphasized rightly the death of Bato the Pannonian, which destroyed unified resistance to the Romans. The subsequent organization of Pannonia is not clearly delineated, but by A.D. 14 Roman troops were garrisoned in the territory (Dio 57. 3) and by A.D. 39 at least one governor, Calvisius Sabinus, had served in Pannonia (Dio 59. 18. 4).

AMANTINIS . . . OBTENTA SUNT: The location of the Amantini inter Sauum et Drauum is confirmed by an inscription (*CIL* III. 3224), but at what time this territory was developed is not certain. Jordanes (*Rom.* 216) seems to follow Festus at this point: Pannonum quoque regem in certamine superans idem Lucius (?) redegit in provinciam utrasque Pannonias. Amantinos autem, qui inter Saum Draumque flumina insident, rege eorum interempto ipsa vice Romanam fecit provinciam.

VIII. MARCOMANNI . . . CONSTITUTUS: Clearly this is a reference to the great Marcomannic War under Marcus Aurelius and is not intended as an introduction to the following sentences. Shortly before A.D. 166 the Marcomanni and Quadi, who had been living peacefully outside the Empire, migrated across the Danube and entered the territory later known as the province of Valeria. In two separate campaigns, 166-72 and 177-80, Marcus Aurelius drove back the invaders and established the Roman frontier along the Danube river (for a discussion of the sources see Franke, *RE* XIV, 2 [1930], 1620-7; on the settlement of the limes Dio 71. 11-12; Herodian 1. 6. 9; *vita Marc.* 22. 2).

TRAIANUS . . . PASSUUM: The sources for Trajan's campaigns against Decebalus and the Dacians are notoriously meagre (the principal accounts are in Dio 68. 6. 1-2, 8. 1-2, 9. 1-7, 10. 1, 11. 3-12. 5, 13. 1-14. 4 and Petr. Patr. fr. 5 in *FHG* 4. 185 - these have been discussed at length by R. Syme, *JRS* 25 [1935],

97 ff. and E. T. Salmon, *TAPhA* 67 [1936], 83 ff.). Scholars have reconstructed the campaigns as follows: in the first (101–2) Trajan captured Sarmizegetusa and placed a garrison in the town, but did not annex Dacia; in 106, after recapturing Sarmizegetusa, Dacia was organized as a province. Festus may well have relied upon Eutropius 8. 2. 2 for his information: *Daciam Decibalo victo subegit provincia Danubium facta . . . ea provincia decies centena milia passuum in circuitu tenuit.*

SED . . . FACTAE SUNT: See the Appendix.

PROVINCIAE . . . CRETA: On Festus' list for Illyricum, see the Appendix.

IX. SAEVISSIMI . . . EXERCITUS: Festus evidently obtained his information concerning the Scordisci from Florus 1. 39. 4 and 2: *Saeuissimi omnium Thracum Scordisci fuere, sed calliditas quoque ad robur accesserat . . . nihil interim per id omen tempus residuum crudelitatis fuit in captivos saevientibus: litare dis sanguine humano, bibere in ossibus capitum. . . .* In turn, Ammianus Marcellinus 27. 4. 4 seems to follow either Florus or Festus or both: *Et partem earum habitavere Scordisci . . . saevi quondam et truces, et (ut antiquitas docet) hostiis captivorum Bellonae litantes et Marti, humanumque sanguinem in ossibus capitum cavis bibentes avidius, quorum asperitate . . . saepe res Romana vexata postremo omnem amisit exercitum, cum rectore (e.g. the defeat of C. Porcius Cato in 114 – Flor. 1. 39. 4; Dio 26, fr. 88. 1; Liv. *Per.* 63; Eutrop. 4. 24).*

MARCUS DIDIUS . . . REPRESSIT: The order of events is confused by Festus (as by Florus and Ammianus), for the account of Didius' campaign should follow that of Drusus and Minucius Rufus. Didius defeated the Scordisci in 101 or 100 B.C. (Flor. 1. 39. 5 – *Didius vagos et libera populatione diffusos intra suam reppulit Thraciam*; Amm. Marc. 27. 4. 10 – *Vagantesque sine cultu vel legibus, Marcus Didius ingenti destinatione repressit*; cp. Jerome *ann.* 100, p. 149 [Helm]).

MARCUS DRUSUS . . . CONTINUIT: M. Livius Drusus, proconsul in Macedonia in 111, chased the Scordisci across the Danube: Flor. 1. 39. 5 – *Drusus ulterius egit et vetuit transire Danuvium*; Amm. Marc. 27. 4. 10 – *Drusus intra fines*

continuit proprios; cp. Liv. *Per.* 63. In 110 he triumphed de Scordisteis Macedonibusque (Degrassi, pp. 84-5).

MINUCIUS . . . UASTAUIT: M. Minucius Rufus campaigned in Macedonia and Thrace against the Bessi, Scordisci, the other Thracian tribes and the Dacians from 110-106: SIG³ 710 A, C; Flor. 1. 39. 5 - Minucius toto vastavit Hebro, multis quidem amissis, dum per perfidium glacie flumen equitatur; Frontin. 2. 4. 3; Liv. *Per.* 65; Eutrop. 4. 27. 5; Amm. Marc. 27. 4. 10 - Minucius prope amnem Hebrum proelio stravit. In 106 he triumphed de Scordisteis et Thraecibus (Degrassi, p. 84 f.; *CIL* 1². 2. 692; Vell. 2. 8. 3).

PER . . . UICTI SUNT: Ap. Claudius Pulcher (proconsul Macedonia in 78-6?) fought successfully the Scordisci and the tribes of Mt. Rhodope, but in 76 became ill and died: Flor. 1. 39. 6; Liv. *Per.* 91; Eutrop. 6. 2. 1; Amm. Marc. 27. 4. 10 - post quos (i.e. Didius, Drusus, Minucius) residui ab Appio Claudio pro consule sunt infesta concertatione deleti; Oros. 5. 23. 17-19. Festus seems to depart from Florus as a source at this point, and may have followed Eutropius 6. 2. 1: Ad Macedoniam missus est Ap. Claudius post consulatum. Levia proelia habuit contra varias gentes, quae Rhodopam provinciam incolabant, atque ibi morbo mortuus est.

EUROPAE . . . OBTINUIT: Festus' source for this is unknown. 'Antea' may refer to the immediately preceding report on Appius Claudius (i.e. before 76 B.C.) or to the entire account of the Thracian campaigns (i.e. before 111 B.C.). I have not been able to discover any action by the Roman fleet before 76 in connection with the Thracian campaigns. Festus may have been the source for Ammianus 27. 4. 10: Oppida enim in Bosporo sita et Propontide classes optinuerunt Romanae.

MARCUS . . . ARMA MONSTRAUIT: M. Terentius Varro Lucullus, proconsul in Macedonia, in 72 B.C. penetrated to the Danube and captured the Greek cities on the shores of the Black Sea. He conquered and triumphed over the Bessi (Eutrop. 6. 10; Jerome *ann.* 71, p. 152 [Helm]; Amm. Marc. 27. 4. 11; Oros. 6. 3. 4; before Lucullus, Minucius Rufus may have fought the Bessi, *CIL* 1², 2, 692), subdued the Haemimontani (Eutrop. 6. 10; Amm. Marc. 27. 4. 11), captured Philippopolis (Amm.

Marc. 27. 4. 12 – Philippopolis, Eumolpiae vetas; cp. Pliny *HN* 4. 40 oppidum . . . Poneropolis antea, mox a conditore Philipopolis, nunc a situ Trimontium dicta), Hadrianopolis (Amm. Marc. 27. 4. 12 Hadrianopolim quae dicebatur Uscudama), and Cabyle (Eutrop. 6. 10; Jerome *ann.* 71, p. 152 [Helm]; Amm. Marc. 31. 11. 5). The capture of the Pontic cities is recorded by the following authors: Eutropius 6. 10 (Apolloniam, Callatim, Parthenopolim, Tomos, Histrum, Burziaonem), Appian *Illyr.* 30 (*Ἰστρος Διονυσόπολις, Ὀδησσός, Μεσημβρία, Κάλλατις, Ἀπολλονία*), and Jerome *ann.* 71, p. 152 [Helm] (Tomis et ceteris vicinis urbibus). On the Pontic cities in general see Strabo 7. 6. 1, 319C, who lists *Ἰστρος, Τόμις, Κάλλατις, Βιζώνη, Κρουνοί, Ὀδησσός, Ναύλοχος, Μεσημβρία, Ἀγχίαλη, Ἀπολλονία*. For his account Festus probably followed Eutropius 6. 10 or a common source (cp. Jord. *Rom.* 221).

ITA . . . CONSTITUTAE: On the six provinces of Thrace listed by Festus see the Appendix.

X. ASIA . . . UINDICATA: The testament of Attalus III (considered a forgery by Sallust, *Hist.* 4. 69M, and Porphyry, *Commentary to Horace Carm.* 2. 18. 5, but authenticated by a decree passed by the demos of Pergamum, *IGR* 4. 289 = *OGI* 338), in which Rome was declared heir to the kingdom of Pergamum, was brought to Rome by Eudemos of Pergamum in 133 B.C. (Strabo 13. 4. 2, 624C; Vell. 2. 4. 1; Val. Max. 5. 2 ext. 3; Flor. 1. 35. 2; Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 14. 1; Justin 36. 4. 5; Ampelius 33. 3; Liv. *Per.* 58, 59; Eutrop. 4. 18; Oros. 5. 8. 4; cf. E. V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon* [1947], 139 ff.); on Festus' source see above, p. 74. The Antiochus in question evidently is Antiochus III, whom the Romans had brought to terms at Apamea in 188 B.C. A much more pertinent 'vindication' would have been the defeat of Aristonicus, who revolted after Attalus' death and was captured by M. Perperna in 130 B.C.

EADEM . . . UENERUNT: By signing the Peace of Apamea Antiochus III ceded all his territory in Asia Minor to the Romans. This was then divided between the principal Roman allies in the war against Antiochus, Rhodes and Eumenes of Pergamum. Eumenes received both Phrygias, Mysia, Lycaonia, Milyada, and Lydia (Polyb. 21. 45. 9–10; Liv. 38. 39. 14). In

133 B.C. this territory came under direct Roman control through the testament of Attalus III of Pergamum and was organized as the province of Asia. Before 369/70 this province had been reorganized and divided into the provinces of Asia, Caria, Lydia, Hellespontus, and Phrygia I and II (cp. Jord. *Rom.* 222). Festus obviously was cognizant of this reorganization and thus lists the fourth-century provinces created by division of the old province of Asia. Eadem occasione, therefore, refers to the testament of 133 B.C.

RHODIIS . . . FACTA EST: Festus seems to have used as a source either Eutropius 7. 19. 4 or some lost history (Kaiser-geschichte?), which is reflected in Suetonius *Vesp.* 8 (almost identical with Eutropius and Oros. 7. 9. 10): Achaiam, Lyciam, Rhodum, Byzantium, Samum libertate adempta, item Thraciam, Ciliciam, et Commagenen ditionis regiae usque ad id tempus, in provinciarum formam redegit. However, in none of these is the new province called Insulae. This title probably was current in the fourth century, for it appears under the diocese of Asia in the *Laterculus Veronensis* and *Not. Dign.* (cp. *Cyclades* in *Laterculus Polemii Silvii* – see the Appendix).

XI. PAMPHYLIA . . . OBTINUIT: P. Servilius Vatia in 77 B.C. began his campaign against the pirates who used the southern coast of Asia Minor as a base of operations. During the next two years, Servilius captured many cities in Lycia and Pamphylia (Flor. 1. 41. 4–5; Liv. *Per.* 93; Eutrop. 6. 3; Oros. 5. 23. 21–2; Amm. Marc. 14. 8. 4) – in Lycia, Olympum (Cic. *Verr.* 2. 1. 56, *Leg. Agr.* 1. 5, 2. 50; Strabo 14. 5. 7, 671C) and Phaselis (Cic. *Verr.* 2. 4. 21, *Leg. Agr.* 2. 50; Strabo 14. 5. 7, 671C; Sallust *Hist.* 1. 129M); in Pamphylia, Corycus (Strabo 14. 5. 7, 671C) and Attaleia (Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 1. 5 and 2. 50). Festus' statement that Servilius 'obtenuit' Pisidia is not supported directly by other sources (but cp. Sallust *Hist.* 1. 130M). Cicero (*Leg. Agr.* 2. 50), however, in his list of the territory acquired by Servilius includes the agrum Aperensem et Oroandicum et Gedusanum (on the location of Aperensem and Gedusanum see W. M. Ramsay, *JHS* 48 [1928], 47). The Ager Oroandicus may be located in the region east of Lake Beyşehir (W. M. Ramsay, *Klio* 22 [1929], 375 ff.; D. Magie, *RRAM*, 1173, n. 25; Strabo 5. 4. 9 lists among the communities of Pisidia the

῾Ορονδικοί). In short, it is possible that Servilius marched northward from Lycia and Pamphylia – after completing the subjugation of the pirates in 76 B.C. – or from Cilicia, after the Isauri had been defeated in 75 B.C. (on the chronology of the campaigns of Servilius see H. A. Ormerod, *JRS* 12 [1922], 38 f.). This expedition evidently was not connected with the campaign against the pirates (it is difficult to account for the presence of pirates in Pisidia), rather it was probably designed as a follow-up to the victory over the Isauri. Thus, despite faulty chronology, Festus seems correct in crediting to Servilius the acquisition of some territory in Pisidia.

BITHYNIAM . . . ADSECUTI: At his death in 74 B.C., Nicomedes IV bequeathed the kingdom of Bithynia to Rome (Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2. 40; Vell. 2. 4. 1 and 39. 2; Appian *Mith.* 71, *BC* 1. 111; Arrian fr. 14, in *FGrH* II B, 855; Ampelius 34. 3; Liv. *Per.* 93; Eutrop. 6. 6. 1). The statement in Scholia Gronoviana (T. Stangl, *Ciceronis Oratorum Scholiastae* II [1912], p. 316, lines 15–17) that Nicomedes died ‘intestatus’ is, as Magie (*RRAM* 1201, n. 49) pointed out, disproved by Cicero, who in 63 B.C. referred to Bithynia as ‘hereditas’. The organization of Bithynia as a province was begun by M. Iuncus, proconsul in Asia (Vell. 2. 42. 3).

GALLOGRAECIAM . . . REDEGIT: To punish the Galatians, who had actively supported Antiochus III against Rome (Liv. 37. 8. 4, 18. 7, 38. 3, 40. 5; Appian *Syr.* 6. 32), an army under Cn. Manlius Vulso was despatched in 189. Shortly before Manlius arrived, the Galatian tribes took refuge in the nearby mountains – the Tolostobogii withdrew to Mt. Olympus, the Tectosagi and Trocmi to Mt. Magaba (Polyb. 21. 37. 9; Liv. 38. 19. 1; Flor. 1. 27. 5; Appian *Syr.* 42). Manlius first attacked the Tolostobogii on Olympus (Liv. 38. 20–1; Flor. 1. 27. 5; Appian *Syr.* 42; Liv. *Per.* 38; Oros. 4. 20. 25) and then besieged and defeated the Tectosagi and Trocmi on Magaba (Liv. 38. 26–7; Flor. 1. 27. 5; Appian *Syr.* 42). Festus in abbreviated form reproduces the Livian account (probably based on portions of Polybius no longer extant and on annalists such as Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias, referred to by Livy 38. 23. 6), which he may have obtained from Florus 1. 27. 5 or from the lost Epitome of Livy.

POSTEA . . . TENUIT: Pompeius reorganized the tribal government of the Galatians so that three tetrarchs instead of twelve (four for each of the three tribes) ruled the country (see Magie *RRAM*, 373 f.). Deiotarus, tetrarch of the Tolostobogii, who had rendered special service to the Romans, was awarded the title of βασιλεὺς and was given some of the territory formerly held by Mithridates (on the title, which was probably confirmed in 59 B.C. – Cic. *Att.* 5. 17. 3, *Har. Resp.* 29, *Deiot.* 10; *Bell. Alex.* 67. 1; Strabo 12. 13, 547C; in an inscription on tumulus B, found near Karala in Turkey – text in *RA* 6 [1935], 142 – Deiotarus is entitled βασιλεὺς Δηϊόταρος Φιλορώμαιος καὶ Γαλατῶν Τολιστοβωγίων καὶ Τρόκμων Τετράρχης; for discussion see Magie *RRAM* 1238, n. 41; on the territory granted to Deiotarus see K. Wellesley *RhM.* N. F. 96 (1953), 293 ff.).

AD EXTREMUM . . . ADMINISTRAUIT: In 36 B.C., Antonius assigned Galatia, Lycaonia, Pisidia, and parts of Pamphylia to Amyntas, Deiotarus' secretary (Dio 49. 32). When Amyntas died in 25 B.C., Augustus established Galatia and Lycaonia as a Roman province (Dio 53. 26. 3), under the proprætor M. Lollius (Eutrop. 7. 10. 2: Galatia quoque sub hoc [Augustus] provincia facta est, cum antea regnum fuisset, primusque eam M. Lollius pro prætore administravit).

CAPPADOCES . . . RESTITUTUS: Apafrace must be a faulty transcription of Ἀριαραθε – Ariarathes IV Eusebes, who, although he had given aid to Antiochus III, sought and secured the amicitia of Rome (Polyb. 21. 40. 4–7; Liv. 38. 37. 5, 39. 6; Strabo 12. 10, 540C; Liv. *Per.* 38). The expulsion of Ariobarzanes, whom Sulla had installed (not restored: see E. Badian, *Athenaeum* n.s. 37 [1959], 279 ff.) as ruler of Cappadocia in 96 B.C., occurred in 90 (Appian *Mith.* 10; Justin 38. 3. 2; Liv. *Per.* 76; Eutrop. 5. 5. 2; Oros. 6. 2. 1). A commission under the leadership of M' Aquillius was despatched in 89 to restore Ariobarzanes; Mithridates peacefully agreed to withdraw from Cappadocia (Appian *Mith.* 11; Justin 38. 3. 4). Aquillius, however, then encouraged Nicomedes of Bithynia to attack Pontus; Mithridates replied by invading Cappadocia again. In 88 the Romans were defeated and control of Cappadocia reverted to Mithridates (Appian *Mith.* 15. 18; Justin 38. 3. 8; Liv. *Per.*

77). These events precipitated the First Mithridatic War (87–85), in which Sulla defeated the Pontic forces and brought Mithridates to terms at Dardanus (in 85). *Inter alia* the settlement provided that Mithridates should evacuate Cappadocia and that Ariobarzanes should be restored (Diod. 38. 6; Plut. *Sulla* 22. 2–24. 3; Appian *Mith.* 54–8; Liv. *Per.* 83).

SEMPER . . . COGNOMINARETUR: The renaming of Mazaca is dated to the reign of Tiberius by Eutropius 7. 11. 2 and Jerome *ann.* 20, p. 172 (Helm), and to the reign of Claudius by Sozomen *H.E.* 5. 4. The change is noted, but not dated, by Pliny *HN* 6. 8 and Amm. Marc. 20. 9. 1. Originally Mazaca was the capital of the Cappadocian kings – at some point, evidently during the reign of Ariarathes V Eusebes (163–30 B.C.), the city was renamed Eusebeia. Archelaus, however, changed the name once more – to Caesarea. According to Imhoof-Blumer (*Revue Suisse de Numismatique* VIII [1898], 10 ff.; cf. Magie *RRAM*, 1353, n. 9) the last coin bearing the name Eusebeia appeared in the twenty-fifth year of Archelaus' reign = 13–12 B.C., the first coin bearing the name Caesarea in regnal year 28 = 10–9 B.C. Thus, he concludes that the name of the capital was changed between 13/12 and 10/9 B.C. – a date which would verify Festus' unique statement that it was done 'in honorem Augusti Caesaris' (cp. Eutrop. 7. 10. 3 – *reges populi Romani amici in honorem eius [Augusti] conderent civitates, quas Caesarea nominarent*).

POSTREMO . . . MIGRAUIT: Archelaus was summoned to Rome by Tiberius and remained there until his death; the kingdom of Cappadocia was annexed in A.D. 17 (Tac. *Ann.* 2. 42. 2–4; Suet. *Tib.* 37 = Eutrop. 7. 11. 2; Dio 57. 17. 3–6; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 2. 3; *Epit. de Caes.* 2. 8) and was placed under a governor of equestrian rank (Tac. *Ann.* 12. 49. 1; Suet. *Vesp.* 8; Dio 57. 17. 7).

PONTUS . . . ACCEPIT: Pompeius defeated Mithridates VI in 66 B.C. and began the organization of Bithynia and Pontus in the spring of 64 (Strabo 12. 3. 2, 541C; Plut. *Pomp.* 36–8; Appian *Mith.* 107; Dio 37. 6. 5; Liv. *Per.* 102; cp. Vell. 2. 38. 6).

PAPHLAGONIA . . . EST: Pylaemenes – the name of the Paphlagonian hero in *Iliad* 2. 851 – was a dynastic name shared

by the rulers of Paphlagonia (Justin. 37. 4. 8 'nomen Paphlagonum regum'). One Paphlagonian Pylaemenes aided Rome against Aristonicus in 133 B.C. (Strabo 14, 646C; Eutrop. 4. 20. 1; Oros. 5. 10. 2) and was granted amicitia (Eutrop. 5. 5. 2). In 101 Mithridates of Pontus and Nicomedes of Bithynia invaded Paphlagonia and drove out Pylaemenes (Justin. 37. 4. 3; Eutrop. 5. 5. 2; Oros. 6. 2. 2; cf. T. Reinach, *Mithridate Eupator* [1890], 89, n. 3). Festus may have obtained his account of Pylaemenes from Eutropius 5. 5. 2: Mox (Mithridates) etiam Bithyniam <incorrect> invasit et Paphlagoniam pulsus [ex ea] regibus, amicis populi Romani, Pylaemeni et Nicomede. Upon appeals from the Paphlagonians, the Roman senate ordered Mithridates and Nicomedes to withdraw from Paphlagonia – both refused. Mithridates claimed that the territory had been willed to his father and was his by inheritance; Nicomedes attempted to legitimize his domination by renaming a son Pylaemenes and placing him on the throne (Strabo 12. 3. 1, 541C; Justin. 37. 3–9). The senate then declared Paphlagonia free (Justin. 38. 2. 7), but not until Pompeius had defeated Mithridates could this decree be implemented; by his settlement in 62 B.C. Attalus was made ruler of the territory (Strabo 12. 3. 1, 541C; Appian *Mith.* 114; Eutrop. 6. 14. 1). In 37/6 B.C. Deiotarus Philadelphus became the last native ruler of Paphlagonia (Strabo 12. 3. 41, 562C; Dio 50. 13; cp. Plut. *Ant.* 61); at his death in 6 B.C., Augustus annexed the kingdom, which became part of the province of Galatia. (*IGR* 3. 135, 137 = *ILS* 8832, 8781; Magie *RRAM*, 1328, n. 47).

XII. ANTIOCHUS . . . PERMISSUS EST: Antiochus III was defeated at Magnesia ad Sipylum in 189 B.C. by L. Cornelius Scipio, brother of Scipio Africanus (Liv. 37. 38–43; Flor. 1. 24. 15; Appian *Syr.* 31. 6; Justin. 31. 8. 6–9; Eutrop. 4. 4. 1–3; Zon. 9. 20). Festus reproduces the estimate of Antiochus' military strength found in Florus 1. 24. 15: trecenta milia peditum, equitum falcatorumque curruum non minor numerus; elephantis ad hoc immensae magnitudinis . . . (cp. Liv. 37. 37. 9 sexaginta milia peditum, plus duodecim milia equitum = Appian *Syr.* 32). By the terms of the peace treaty signed at Apamea, Antiochus withdrew from Europe and Asia and agreed to remain within the territory east of the Taurus mountains

(Polyb. 21. 17. 3 = Liv. 37. 45. 14; Diod. 29. 10; Flor. 1. 24. 18; Appian *Syr.* 38; Justin. 31. 8. 6-9; Eutrop. 4. 4. 3).

EIUS . . . POTITI SUMUS: The only son of Antiochus III to rule in Syria was Antiochus IV (175-63 B.C.). During his reign the conditions of the treaty of Apamea were observed, and Rome exercised little overt interference (exceptions: Polyb. 30. 27. 1f., 30. 5f., 31. 1. 6f.). However, 'filius' probably should not be taken literally - it may refer to the dynasty of Antiochus. In that sense Antiochus may be Antiochus XIII Asiaticus, a client king, whose career may be summarized as follows (for discussion of sources and chronology see G. Downey, *TAPhA* 82 [1951], 149 ff.): sent to Rome in 72 B.C., reinstated by Lucullus as King of Syria in 69 (after Tigranes had evacuated Syria, which he had occupied since 83), forced to abdicate in favour of Philip II by Pompeius in 67/6, and raised once again to the throne in 65/4 only to be removed finally one year later, at which time Pompeius carried through the reorganization of Syria as a Roman province. Festus is rather misleading when he says that Syria became a province after the 'death' of Antiochus (cf. Vell. 2. 37. 5; Plut. *Pomp.* 39; Appian *Mith.* 106, *Syr.* 49 and 70; Justin. 40. 2. 2 and 5).

CILICES . . . COGNOMINATUS: P. Servilius Vatia in 77/6 B.C. campaigned against the Cilices, a common designation for the pirates who harassed the Mediterranean (Cic. *Verr.* 2. 3. 211, 4. 21, *Leg. Agr.* 1. 5, 2. 50; Vell. 2. 39. 2; Liv. *Per.* 90; Eutrop. 6. 3; Oros. 5. 23. 21). In 75 he crossed the Taurus mountains and subdued the Isaurians (Cic. *Verr.* 2. 3. 211; Strabo 12. 6. 2, 586C; Flor. 1. 41. 5; Liv. *Per.* 93; Eutrop. 6. 3; Oros. 5. 23. 22). Magie (*RRAM*, 1171, n. 22) and Ormerod (*JRS* 12 [1922], 36 f.) correctly doubt that the Isaurians were allied with the Cilices (=pirates) in any way. In 75 Servilius took the cognomen Isauricus (*Fasti Capit.* ann. 79, Degrassi p. 484; *CIL* 1². 2. 741; Strabo 12. 6. 2, 586C; Vell. 2. 39. 2; Val. Max. 8. 5. 6; Ampelius 23; Eutrop. 6. 3) and in the following year triumphed (Cic. *Verr.* 2. 1. 57 and 5. 66; Val. Max. 8. 5. 6; Eutrop. 6. 3; Claud. *In Eutrop.* 1. 217). For his account, Festus undoubtedly relied upon Eutropius 6. 3 or a common source.

XIII. CYPRUS . . . ADSECUTI: From the reign of Ptolemy I

Cyprus was part of the Egyptian kingdom. In 80 B.C. – after deposing their cousin, Ptolemy II Alexander, who had ruled for nineteen days – Ptolemy XII Auletes succeeded to the Egyptian throne and his brother became ruler of Cyprus. The Romans, however, claimed that the kingdom had been bequeathed to them by Ptolemy II Alexander and threatened to expel the new monarchs. In 59 Auletes bought off the Romans, secured confirmation of his tenure in Egypt, and became *amicus et socius* (Cic. *Pro Rab. Post.* 6, *Att.* 2. 16. 2; *Caes. BC* 3. 107. 2; *Suet. Iul.* 54. 3; *Dio* 39. 12. 1). In the following year, the Triumvirs, using the ‘testament’ of Ptolemy II Alexander as legal justification, decided to annex Cyprus. To this end M. Porcius Cato Uticensis, under a bill carried by the tribune P. Clodius Pulcher, was appointed *quaestor pro praetore*. After the Cypriote king committed suicide, Cato confiscated the treasury, established the country as a province, and returned to Rome (Cic. *De domo sua* 20, 52, *Pro Sestio* 57, 59–61; *Strabo* 14. 6. 6, 684C; *Vell.* 2. 38. 6, 45. 4–5; *Val. Max.* 4. 1. 14, 8. 15. 10, 9. 4. ext. 1; *Plut. Pomp.* 48, *Cat. Min.* 34–8, *Brut.* 3; *Flor.* 1. 44. 2–5; *Appian BC* 2. 23; *Dio* 38. 30. 5, 39. 22; *Liv. Per.* 104; *Vir Ill.* 80. 2; for discussion see S. I. Oost *CPh* 50 [1955], 98 ff.). Cicero (*loc. cit.*) considered this annexation an unwarranted imperialistic act directed against a friendly sovereign (not *foederatus*, however, as Festus states). Festus’ judgment, *auarius magis quam iustius*, is repeated verbatim by Ammianus (14. 8. 14). Festus seems to have followed Florus *loc. cit.* in his account, albeit with some slight alterations. For example, when Festus writes *Cyprus, famosa diuitiis et tanta fuit penuria aerarii et tam ingens opum fama Cypriarum, ut lege Cyprus confiscari iuberetur*, he is probably rendering imperfectly – whether by design or carelessly is not certain – the words of Florus: *insulam veteribus diuitiis abundantem . . . diuitiarum tanta erat fama ut victor gentium populus et donare regna consuetus P. Clodio tribuno plebis duce . . . confiscationem mandaverit . . . quae res latius aerarium P. R. quam ullus triumphus implevit* (cp. *Vell.* 2. 45. 5 *unde pecuniam longe sperata maiorem Cato Romam retulit*).

CYRENAS . . . ADSECUTI: According to the testament of Ptolemy VIII, Euergetes II in 155 B.C. (*SEG IX*, 7), Cyrene

was bequeathed to Rome in the event that Ptolemy should die without heirs. However, this did not occur, for on his death in 116, Cyrene passed to his illegitimate son Ptolemy Apion (included among the friends and allies of Rome in 101/100 B.C. – *SEG* III, 378B; cf. H. S. Jones, *JRS* 16 [1926], 162 ff.). He, in turn, bequeathed Cyrene to Rome in 96 (Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2. 51; Sallust *Hist.* fr. 1. 10M; Appian *BC* 1. 111, *Mith.* 121; Tac. *Ann.* 14. 18. 2; Justin. 39. 5. 2–4; Liv. *Per.* 70; Obsequens 49; Jerome *ann.* 96, p. 149 [Helm]; Cassiodorus *Chron.* a. u. c. 658 Mommsen); it did not become a province until 75 or 74 (Sallust *Hist.* fr. 2. 43M; Appian *BC* 1. 111; on the history of Cyrene 96–74 B.C. see S. I. Oost in *CPh* 58 [1963], 11 ff.; on Festus' source see above, p. 81).

Festus, on the other hand, reports that the Romans acquired Cyrene and the remaining cities of Libya Pentapolis (= Libya superior) from Ptolemy Antiquioris – i.e. from Ptolemy VIII Euergetes, the father of Ptolemy Apion; Libya became a Roman territory through Apion's testament. Festus, as many scholars have pointed out (initially P. Thrige, *Res Cyrenensium* [1828; reprinted 1940], 305–8), imperfectly understood his source, which evidently reported both testaments but failed to point out that Ptolemy VIII Euergetes' will was made null and void by the birth of an heir, Ptolemy Apion. Festus attempted to make the passage intelligible in terms of his own knowledge: he reports, therefore, that Libya Pentapolis (= Libya superior) – which included Cyrene in the fourth century A.D. – had been ceded to Rome by Ptolemy VIII, while Libya (= inferior) had been added to the Empire through Apion's testament (see De Sanctis, *RFIC* n. s. 10 [1932], 63). Ammianus (22. 16. 24) followed Festus almost verbatim: *Aridiorem Libyam supremo Apionos regis consecuti sumus arbitrio, Cyrenas cum residuis civitatibus Libyae Pentapoleos* (i.e. one of the provinces of Aegyptus – Amm. Marc. 22. 16. 4), *Ptolomaei liberalitate suscepimus* (cp. Jord. *Rom.* 229).

AEGYPTUS . . . ADMINISTRAUIT: The *amici reges* are the members of the Ptolemaic dynasty. After Actium, Augustus annexed Egypt and appointed C. Cornelius Gallus as its first governor (*Mon. Ancyr.* 27. 1; Strabo 17. 1. 53, 819C; Suet. *Aug.* 66; Dio 51. 17. 1; Eutrop. 7. 7 [the source of Festus?]; Jerome

ann. 33, p. 162 [Helm]; *Epit. de Caes.* 1. 4; Servius, *Comm. in Verg. Buc.* 10. 1; Amm. Marc. 17. 4. 5; coins with legend AEGYPTO CAPTA, Mattingly *CREBM* I, 106, nos. 650–5).

XIV. Since almost every item in this chapter is repeated and/or augmented in a later chapter, I have deferred discussion until the subjects reappear in a different context (on Lucullus and Pompeius see chs. XV and XVI; on Trajan and Hadrian, ch. XX; on the Antonines, ch. XXI; on Diocletian, ch. XXV).

XV. PRIMUM . . . MERUIT: L. Cornelius Sulla (propraetor in Cilicia) received the first legates from the Parthians in 92 B.C. (Vell. 2. 24. 3; Plut. *Sulla* 5. 4; Liv. *Per.* 70; modern discussion by J. Dobiaš in *AO* [1931], 218 ff.). On Parthian chronology see J. Wolski, *Berytus* 12 (1956–7), 35 ff.

LUCIUS . . . ACCEPIT: L. Licinius Lucullus (proconsul in Asia and Cilicia) drove Mithridates out of Asia and Bithynia in 73 B.C. and began the invasion of Pontus. In the following year (as proconsul in Asia, Cilicia, Bithynia, and Pontus), he forced Mithridates to take refuge with Tigranes in Armenia and began the subjugation of Pontic cities (Memnon 45, in *FGrH* 38. 359 = *FHG* 3. 549–50; Strabo 12. 3. 11, 546C, 14, 547C; Plut. *Luc.* 17–19; Appian *Mith.* 79–82; Eutrop. 6. 8. 3; J. van Ooteghem, *Lucius Licinius Lucullus* [Bruxelles, 1959], 91 ff.). Lucullus demanded that Mithridates be surrendered, but Tigranes refused (Memnon 46, in *FGrH* 3B, 360 = *FHG* 3. 550; Plut. *Luc.* 19. 1, 24. 1; Appian *Mith.* 83). In 69 Lucullus invaded Armenia, defeated Tigranes, and captured Tigranocerta. The relative strength of the opposing armies at Tigranocerta is estimated variously: Tigranes (Frontin. 21. 1. 14 innumerabiles multitudines; Phlegon Trall, 12 in *FHG* 3. 606, infantry 40,000, cavalry 30,000; Plut. *Luc.* 26. 6, bowmen 20,000, infantry 150,000, cavalry 55,000; Memnon 57, *FHG* 3. 556 = *FGrH* 3 B. 366, total of 80,000; Appian *Mith.* 85, infantry 250,000, cavalry 50,000; Eutrop. 6. 9. 1 cum septem milibus quingentis clibanariis et centum milibus sagittariorum et armatorum); Lucullus (Frontin. 2. 1. 14, non amplius quindecim milia; Plut. *Luc.* 27. 2, infantry 10,000, others 1,000; Appian *Mith.* 84, infantry two legions, cavalry 500; Eutrop. 6. 9. 1, 18,000; see van Ooteghem, *ibid.*, 116 ff.). Concerning

the marked similarity between the account in Festus and that in Eutropius 6. 9. 1 see above, pp. 82-3.

In 68 Lucullus marched through Madaena (= Motene, a district of Armenia on the river Cyrus - J. Sturm *RE* suppl. VI [1935], 541; = Media, A. Maricq, *Syria* 35 [1958], 306, n. 5 [cf. Festus ch. XVIII]) and Melitena and captured Nisibis: Plut. *Luc.* 32. 3-5; Dio 36. 7; Eutrop. 6. 9. 1; Oros. 6. 3. 7; van Ooteghem, *ibid.*, 139 ff. A concentrated invasion of Parthian territory was planned, but mutinies in the army prevented action. Upon learning that Sornantius, Lucullus' legate, could not induce the 6000 troops in Pontus to join the main army in Armenia (Plut. *Luc.* 30. 3), Lucullus' own troops refused to take part in the campaign (Plut. *Luc.* 30. 4, 31. 1; Dio 36. 14. 3-17. 3). In 66, the tribune C. Manilius carried a bill to give Pompeius command in Cilicia, Bithynia, Pontus, and of the war against Mithridates: Vell. 2. 33. 1; Plut. *Luc.* 35. 7, *Pomp.* 30; Appian *Mith.* 97; Dio 36. 43. 1-2; Liv. *Per.* 100. Festus' statement that Lucullus was replaced in the midst of preparations for a campaign against the Parthians is somewhat misleading. As I have pointed out, the proposed campaign was cancelled in 68; Pompeius did not assume command until 66. The source of this misleading compression may be Eutropius 6. 9. 3: *Lucullo paranti capta Nisibi contra Persas expeditionem successor est missus.*

XVI. CN. POMPEIUS . . . IMPETRAUIT: In 66 B.C. Pompeius, having replaced Lucullus as commander of the Roman army in the East, engaged and defeated Mithridates in a night battle in Armenia Minor (Plut. *Pomp.* 32; Frontin. 2. 1. 12, 5. 33; Flor. 1. 40. 23-4; Liv. *Per.* 101; *Vir. Ill.* 76. 7; Eutrop. 6. 12. 2; Oros. 6. 4. 3-6; Jord. *Rom.* 233; cp. Appian *Mith.* 100 who says that the battle was not fought at night; see T. Reinach, *Mith. Eup.*, 385-7). None of the sources agrees with the estimate of Mithridates' losses given by Festus (Appian *Mith.* 100, 10,000; Eutrop. 6. 12. 2 (= Oros. 6. 4. 5), 40,000; cp. Plut. *Pomp.* 32. 1 who puts the total number of troops under Mithridates at 30,000 infantry, 2000 cavalry). Mithridates fled to the kingdom of the Colchi (Reinach, *ibid.*, 388 ff.) and for the next two years, by luck and cleverness, was able to evade capture. Finally, in 63, Mithridates arrived in Pontus - in the teeth of a revolt fomented

by his son Pharnaces, who deposed his father and was saluted as King (Plut. *Pomp.* 41. 5; Flor. 1. 40. 26; Appian *Mith.* 110–11; Liv. *Per.* 102; *Vir. Ill.* 76. 7; Eutrop. 6. 12. 3; Oros. 6. 5. 4–5). Desperatione rerum suarum Mithridates attempted suicide by taking poison, but his carefully established immunity – built up by taking small quantities of poison from time to time in order to thwart regicides – nullified its force (Appian *Mith.* 111; Liv. *Per.* 102; *Vir. Ill.* 76. 8; Oros. 6. 5. 6). He then ordered one of his officers, a Gaul, to finish the job (quite similar names for the officer are found: Appian *Mith.* 111, Bituitus; Liv. *Per.* 102, Bitocus; *Vir. Ill.* 76. 8, Bithocus; Oros. 6. 5. 6 simply Gallum quendam militem). On the other hand, Florus (1. 40. 26) reports that M. temptatum veneno spiritum ferro expulit, Eutropius (6. 12. 3) says that venenum hausit, and Orosius (6. 5. 6) that Mithridates was strangled by a certain Gallic soldier. On Festus' source(s) see above, p. 83.

POMPEIUS . . . PERMISSUS EST: Soon after his victory over Mithridates, Pompeius turned against Tigranes in Armenia, who surrendered unconditionally. Pompeius demanded that certain areas be ceded to Rome (Vell. 2. 37. 5, Syria aliaque; Plut. *Pomp.* 33. 4, Syria, Phoenicia, Cilicia, Galatia and Sophene [part of Armenia]; Appian *Mith.* 105, Syria [including Cilicia]; Dio 36. 53. 2, Cappadocia, Syria, Phoenicia, Sophene; Liv. *Per.* 101, Syria, Phoenicia, Cilicia; Eutrop. 6. 13, Syria, Phoenicia, Sophanene [sic]; on Pompeius' Eastern settlement see J. van Ooteghem, *Pompée le grand* [1954], 244 ff.), and that an indemnity of 6000 talents be paid (Plut. *Pomp.* 33. 4; Appian *Mith.* 104; Eutrop. 6. 13); in return he agreed that Tigranes should rule in Armenia (Val. Max. 5. 1. 9; Strabo 11. 14. 10, 530C; Vell. 2. 37. 5; Plut. *Pomp.* 33. 5; Flor. 1. 40. 27; Appian *Mith.* 105; Liv. *Per.* 101; Eutrop. 6. 13; Jord. *Rom.* 234).

IDEM . . . INPOSUIT: Pompeius' campaign against the Colchi and other Caucasian tribes took place in 65 B.C. (Plut. *Pomp.* 34. 5; Flor. 1. 40. 28; Appian *Mith.* 103; Dio 37. 3. 1–2; Liv. *Per.* 101; Eutrop. 6. 14. 1; Auctor, *Vir. Ill.* 77. 6; Jord. *Rom.* 234; Oros. 6. 4. 9). Only Appian (*Mith.* 114), Eutropius (6. 4. 1) and Festus report that Aristarchus was placed over the Colchi by Pompeius – coins indicate that he did not receive the title

of King (Reinach, *op. cit.*, 400, n. 3). For a discussion of Festus' sources see above, p. 83 f.

CUM ALBANIS . . . DEDIT: Pompeius gained his victory over the Albani in 65 B.C. (Vell. 2. 40. 1; Strabo 11. 4. 5, 502C; Plut. *Pomp.* 35. 1-3; Flor. 1. 40. 28; Appian *Mith.* 103; Dio 37. 4-5. 1; Liv. *Per.* 101; Eutrop. 6. 14. 1; Oros. 6. 4. 8; Jord. *Rom.* 234; van Ooteghem, *Pompée*, 220 ff.). Justinus (42. 3. 4) reports that Pompeius cum Albanis foedus percussit – i.e. with the Albanian king, Orhodes (Orodes – Florus, Eutropius, Orosius; 'Οροίζης Appian; 'Οροίσης Dio). Festus' account parallels closely that of Eutropius: Pompeius mox etiam Albanis bellum intulit et eorum regem Oroden ter vicit, postremo . . . ei . . . pacem dedit.

HIBERIAM . . . ACCEPIT: Pompeius defeated the Iberians in 66 B.C. (Vell. 2. 40. 1; Flor. 1. 40. 28; Appian *Mith.* 103; Dio 37. 1-2; Liv. *Per.* 101; Eutrop. 6. 14. 1; Oros. 6. 3. 8). Artoces (Florus, Appian, Dio) seems preferable to Artaces (Eutropius, Orosius).

SARACENOS . . . UICIT (cp. ch. XIV, in which reference to the Saraceni is missing): Pompeius completed the subjugation of Asia Minor in 64 B.C. and conducted a campaign against Aretas III, King of the Nabatean Arabs (Plut. *Pomp.* 41-2; Flor. 1. 40. 30; Dio 37. 15. 1-2; Appian *Mith.* 106; *Vir. Ill.* 77. 6; Eutrop. 6. 14. 1; Oros. 6. 6. 1). On Festus' reference to the Saraceni see above, p. 77.

IUDAEA . . . OBTINUIT (cp. ch. XIV): In 63 B.C. Pompeius intervened in the dynastic quarrels of the Judean princes, besieged and captured Jerusalem, and appointed Hyrcanus high-priest (Joseph. *AJ* 14. 58-74, *BJ* 1. 138-154; Plut. *Pomp.* 39. 2; Flor. 1. 40. 30; Dio 37. 15. 2-16. 4; Appian *Syr.* 50, *Mith.* 106; Liv. *Per.* 102; Eutrop. 6. 14. 2; Jerome *ann.* 67, p. 153 [Helm]; Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2. 26. 5-6; Oros. 6. 6. 2-4; cf. van Ooteghem, *Pompée*. 229 ff.).

CUM . . . ICIT (cp. ch. III): Some agreement – sealed by a foedus or by grant of amicitia – was reached with the Parthians in 66 B.C. (foedus – Flor. 1. 40. 31; Ampelius 31. 3; amicitia – Justin. 42. 4. 6; Liv. *Per.* 100; cp. Dio 36. 45. 3 and 51. 1). In the following year, however, this arrangement was abrogated

by L. Afranius, Pompeius' legate, who took Gordyene and Osrhoene by force from the Parthians (Plut. *Pomp.* 36. 2).

XVII. MARCUS CRASSUS . . . CONBURERET: Under the Lex Trebonia of 55 B.C., M. Licinius Crassus received Syria as his province for five years; ignoring unfavourable omens, he set sail for the East in November (Vell. 2. 46. 2; Plut. *Pomp.* 52. 3-4, *Crass.* 15. 5-16. 3, *Cat. Min.* 43. 1; Flor. 1. 46. 2; Appian *BC* 2. 18; Dio 39. 33. 2; Liv. *Per.* 105; Eutrop. 6. 18. 1). Crassus reached Syria in 54 and began preparations for a Parthian campaign. He raided Mesopotamian territory across the Euphrates and then returned to winter quarters in Syria (Plut. *Crass.* 17. 2-4; Flor. 1. 46. 3; Dio 40. 12-13; Oros. 6. 13. 2). In the spring (53), the Parthian king, Orodes, sent legates to discover Crassus' plans, but to these Crassus replied that he would give his answer in Selucia (Plut. *Crass.* 18. 1-2 *πρὸς ταῦτα Κράσσου κομπασάντος ὡς ἐν Σελευκείᾳ δώσει τὰς ἀποκρίσεις* – before the army crossed the Euphrates at Zeugma; Flor. 1. 46 – *Seleucia se responsurum esse respondit* – the legates came to the Roman camp at Nicephorium, established after Crassus had crossed the Euphrates; Dio 40. 16. 3 *ὁ οὖν Κράσσος ἐκείνῳ τε ἐν Σελευκείᾳ . . . τὰς αἰτίας τοῦ πολέμου ἐρεῖν ἔφη* – before crossing the Euphrates; on Ctesiphon and Festus' source see above, p. 76). He then crossed the Euphrates at Zeugma and marched south into Parthian territory. Whether a certain Mazzaro led Crassus' army *ad ignotam camporum solitudinem* cannot be determined – this tale may have been fabricated to mitigate the humiliation of the subsequent defeat or, conversely, to emphasize Crassus' failure as a military leader – but similar accounts are found elsewhere (Plut. *Crass.* 21. 1, an Arab chief, *Ἀριάμνης*, who had assisted Pompeius and was therefore thought to be pro-Roman, came to Crassus and induced him to lead his army into a boundless plain [*πεδῖον ἀχανές*]; Flor. 1. 46. 6-7, Crassus was led by a Syrian named Mazzara, who conducted the army in *mediam camporum vastitatem* . . . *ut undique hosti exponeretur*; Dio 40. 20-5 *Ἀβγαρος ὁ Ὀρροηνὸς*, pretending to be a friend of Rome, led Crassus into an ambush in which the Romans suffered heavy losses; cp. the judicious remarks of N. C. Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia* [1938], 85).

Near Carrhae Crassus engaged a Parthian expeditionary

force of mailed horsemen (cataphracti) under Surena, Orodes' commander, and the satrap Silaces; in this battle Crassus' son, Publius, was killed and the Roman army was defeated (Plut. *Crass.* 24. 4-27. 2; Dio 40. 21-4; Liv. *Per.* 106). Crassus then withdrew to Carrhae at night, but quickly abandoned this indefensible town and retreated through the mountains in an effort to reach Armenia (Plut. *Crass.* 27. 5-8; Dio 40. 25. 1-5). Plutarch (29. 6-31. 7) reports that the Parthians surrounded and defeated the Romans not far from Carrhae, but surprisingly offered to discuss a peace settlement with Crassus. Dio (40. 26. 1-2), on the other hand, does not mention the second Roman defeat, but does record the peace negotiations. Whether a second battle was fought cannot be determined; the divergence in our sources is minor in any case. The tradition represented by Dio (Livian?) is followed by Vell. 2. 46. 4, Flor. 1. 46. 8, Justin. 42. 4. 4, Ampelius 31. 3, Liv. *Per.* 106, Eutrop. 6. 18. 1, Oros. 6. 13. 3, and Festus (cf. Debevoise, *ibid.*, 88-91).

Crassus reluctantly accepted Surena's offer and, accompanied by his legate, Octavius, and a legionary tribune, Petronius, began negotiations. As a result of some misunderstanding, however, the conference ended in disorder and Crassus was killed (Plut. *Crass.* 31. 4-6; Flor. 1. 46. 9; Dio 40. 26. 2-27. 2; Liv. *Per.* 106; Oros. 6. 13. 4). After a mock triumph had been held, Surena cut off the head and hand of Crassus and sent these to Orodes in Armenia (Plut. *Crass.* 32. 1-2, 33. 2; Flor. 1. 46. 11, may have been Festus' source; cp. Dio 40. 27. 3). In general, Festus' account is factual, although compression - perhaps inherited from his source - has obscured somewhat the sequence of events. For the most extensive modern commentary on Crassus' Parthian campaign see A. Garzetti (*Athenaeum* n.s. 22-3 [1944-5], 35 ff.).

LUCIUS . . . UASTAUT: C. Cassius Longinus, Crassus' *quaestor*, gathered together the remnants of the Roman army after Carrhae and retreated into Syria, where he regrouped his forces to repel the inevitable invasion by the victorious Parthians. In October 51 B.C., a large Parthian army under Pacorus, son of Orodes, crossed the Euphrates and marched toward Antioch. There a major battle was fought between XIII Kal. October and IV Kal. January 51 B.C., in which

Cassius defeated the Parthians and killed their leader, Osaces (Cic. *Fam.* 15. 1. 2, *Att.* 5. 18. 1, 20. 3, cp. *Phil.* 11. 35; Vell. 2. 46. 4-5; Joseph. *Bj* 1. 180, *Aj* 14. 119; Frontin. 2. 5. 35; Dio 40. 28. 3-29. 3; Liv. *Per.* 108; Oros. 6. 13. 5). Since Cassius remained in Syria until M. Calpurnius Bibulus was sent as a replacement in 51 B.C. (i.e. from late 53 until late 51), Festus' statement that he fought the Parthians on three occasions is at least possible. Indeed, Dio (40. 28. 2) reports that the Parthians conducted an abortive raid across the Euphrates before their major attack under Pacorus (cf. Eutropius 6. 18. 2: [Cassius] *Persas rediens trans Euphraten crebris proeliis vinceret*).

XVIII. PARTHI . . . TRIUMPHAUT: In late 43/early 42 B.C. Quintus Labienus was sent to the Parthians by Brutus and Cassius to solicit aid against Antony and Octavian. After the defeat of the Pompeian army at Philippi had invalidated his mission, Labienus offered his services to the Parthians. In 41/40 they invaded Syria, drove out Antony's legate, L. Decidius Saxa, captured him in Cilicia and put him to death (Strabo 14. 2. 24, 660C; Vell. 2. 78. 1; Joseph. *Bj* 1. 248-9; Plut. *Ant.* 30. 1; Dio 48. 24. 4-25. 4; Flor. 2. 19. 3-4; Justin. 42. 4. 7; Liv. *Per.* 127). P. Ventidius was despatched with an army to recover Syria in 40 (Plut. *Ant.* 33. 1; Appian *BC* 5. 65; Dio 48. 39. 2). In the following year Ventidius defeated Labienus and the Parthians near the Taurus mountains and pursued them into the Amanus mountains, where he defeated and killed Labienus (Joseph. *Bj* 1. 288, *Aj* 14. 392; Plut. *Ant.* 33. 4; Flor. 2. 19. 5; Dio 48. 39. 3-41. 4; Frontin. 2. 5. 36; Liv. *Per.* 127; on Capro Monte see above, pp. 39-40). Early in 38 Ventidius once again defeated the Parthians and killed their leader, Pacorus, son of Orodes (Vell. 2. 78. 1; Plut. *Ant.* 34. 1-2; Joseph. *Bj* 1. 317, *Aj* 14. 434; Dio 49. 19. 1-20. 1; Frontin. 1. 1. 6, 2. 5. 37; Tac. *Hist.* 5. 9; Flor. 2. 19. 7; Justin. 42. 4. 8-10; Liv. *Per.* 128; Eutrop. 7. 5. 2; Oros. 6. 18. 23; see J. E. Seaver, *Class Journ.* 47 [1952], 275 ff.; H. Gundel *RE* 2, Reihe xv [1955], 807 ff.), Ventidius celebrated a triumph *ex Tauro monte et Partheis* in 38 (Degrassi, pp. 86-7 and *Fast. Barb.*, p. 342 f; Vell. 2. 65. 3; Val. Max. 6. 9. 9; Plut. *Ant.* 34. 5; Pliny *HN* 7. 135; Suet. *Hist.* fr. 210 R = Gell. 15. 4. 4; Eutrop. 7. 5. 2).

M. ANTONIUS . . . POTESTATEM. M. Antonius succeeded

Ventidius in 38, but spent the year campaigning against Antiochus of Commagene. Nor did he attack the Parthians in the following year, for he returned to Italy to meet with Octavian at Tarentum. Finally, in 36 he marched through Armenia and besieged Praaspa (classical Vera = Takht-i-Sûlaimân), capital of Media Atropatene, but the approach of winter compelled him to withdraw. Returning to winter quarters in Armenia he lost two legions from bad weather and from incessant attacks by the Parthians (on the siege of Praaspa – Plut. *Ant.* 38. 2–40. 5; on the loss of two legions – Vell. 2. 82. 2; Plut. *Ant.* 42. 2–4; Flor. 2. 20. 3; Liv. *Per.* 130; on losses from bad weather and famine – Plut. *Ant.* 45. 4–6, 51. 1; Flor. 2. 20. 9; Eutrop. 7. 6. 2). Festus probably used Florus (e.g. 2. 20. 10 – subinde inter moras mortem a gladiatore suo flagitasset egregius imperator tandem perfugit in Syriam) or a common source.

XIX. SUB OCTAVIANO . . . CONSPIRAUIT: Around 6 B.C. Tigranes II of Armenia died and was succeeded by his anti-Roman son, Tigranes III. Tiberius was despatched to secure the investiture of a pro-Roman monarch, but he called at Rhodes and remained there for the next seven years. Meanwhile, Augustus decreed that Artavasdes II should become King of Armenia. His tenure was brief, however, for Tigranes III – aided by Phraataces, the Parthian king – regained control in 1 B.C. (Vell. 2. 99. 4, 100. 1; Tac. *Ann.* 2. 3. 2, 4. 1).

CLAUDIUS . . . OBIT: Soon after Tigranes III had returned to power, Augustus sent his grandson Gaius to settle the Armenian succession. Tigranes III then capitulated and received from Augustus official recognition as ruler of Armenia; at the same time Phraataces agreed to drop his claim to Armenia. This arrangement endured until the death of Tigranes III in A.D. 1; Gaius selected Ariobarzanes – son of Artbazus, king of the Medes – to govern Armenia (*Mon. Ancyr.* 27. 2; Tac. *Ann.* 2. 4. 1). The Armenians were not satisfied, however, and Gaius was called upon to suppress a substantial uprising. He besieged Artagira (*CIL* IX. 5290; Vell. 2. 102. 2; Flor. 2. 32), which was defended by Donnes (Donnes – Flor. 2. 32; Ἀδών – Strabo II. 14. 6, 529C; Adduus – Vell. 2. 102. 2; Ἀδδων – Dio 55. 10a. 6 [Xiph.]), who probably was the Parthian satrap for the area. During a conference held near Artagira – 9 September

A.D. 3 – this man wounded Gaius; thereupon the Romans evidently lifted the siege and withdrew. In the following year, Gaius died from these wounds at Limyra in Lycia (*CIL* IX. 5290; Vell. 2. 102. 2; Suet. *Aug.* 65. 1; Flor. 2. 32 – in Syria Gaius ex vulnere occubuit; Dio 50. 10a. 8–9). Festus probably obtained his account from Florus 2. 32 (see especially *Donnes . . . simulata prodicione, adortus virum intentum libello, quem ut thensaurorum rationes continentem ipse porrexerat, stricto repente ferro subiit*; cp. Dio 55. 10a. 6 [Xiph.]). Arsaces (= Phraataces) was the dynastic name used by the kings of the Parthians (Debevoise, *op. cit.*, 10, n. 40). The statement that Gaius appointed iudices ex instituto Pompei probably is an application of Florus – Armenios . . . in hoc usum servitutis genus Pompeius adsueverat, ut rectores a nobis acciperent – and does not refer to any specific Pompeian legislation.

PERSAE . . . RETULERUNT: Not one of the events described in this sentence occurred after the death of Gaius – Festus is completely misleading at this point.

Two sets of Parthian ‘obsides’ were brought to Rome. During the winter of 30/29 B.C. Octavian granted asylum in Syria to Tiridates II, who had been driven out of Armenia by the Parthians. Phraates IV, the Parthian king, demanded that Octavian extradite Tiridates and return his son, whom Tiridates had kidnapped; Octavian ignored the request and took both to Rome. Later (between 29 and 26 B.C. – Debevoise, *op. cit.*, 136–7) Octavian did release Phraates’ son on condition that Crassus’ standards be restored. These were returned on 12 May 20 B.C. and were received by Tiberius (*Hor. Carm.* 4. 15. 6–8, *Ep.* 1. 12. 27–8, 18–56; Propertius 4. 6. 79–86; Ovid *Fasti* 5. 580–98, 6. 465–8; *Mon. Ancy.* 29. 2; Vell. 2. 91. 1; Suet. *Aug.* 21. 3, *Tib.* 9. 1; Flor. 2. 34. 63; Justin. 42. 5. 11; Liv. *Per.* 141; Eutrop. 7. 9; Oros. 6. 21. 29; coins bearing variations of the legend SIGNIS . PARTHICIS . RECEPIS – Mattingly-Sydenham, *RIC* I [1923], p. 63 nos. 46–8, p. 70 nos. 98–100, p. 84 no. 256, p. 86 nos. 302–4, pp. 86–7 nos. 305–10, p. 87 nos. 311–13).

In 10/9 B.C. Phraates IV of Parthia, in order to avoid a clash over the succession, entrusted to M. Titius, the Roman governor of Syria, his four sons – Seraspadanes, Phraates, Rhodaspes, Vonones. These were sent to Rome as guests, but are termed

obsides in many of the sources (*Mon. Ancyr.* 32. 2 – ad me Parthorum Phrates Orodís filius filios suos nepotesque omnes misit in Italiam non bello superatus, sed amicitiam nostram per liberorum suorum pignora petens; *Tac. Ann.* 2. 1; obsides – *Vell.* 2. 94. 4; *Suet. Aug.* 43. 4; *Justin.* 42. 5. 12; *Oros.* 6. 21. 29; cf. J. Gagé (ed.) *Mon. Ancyr* [1935], 142). Seraspadanes and Rhodaspes died in Rome (*CIL* VI, 1799 = *ILS* 842).

PACATIS . . . ACCEPIT: During the reign of Augustus a number of embassies from Eastern countries arrived in Rome: among these certainly were the Indi and Scythae and perhaps the Bastarnae (*Mon. Ancyr.* 31), Sarmatae (*Mon. Ancyr.* 31; *Flor.* 2. 34; *Vir. Ill.* 79. 5), and Garamantes (*Verg. Aen.* 6. 794–5; *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 1; *Epit. de Caes.* 1). In addition embassies from the Seres (*Flor.* 2. 34; *Hor. Odes* 1. 12. 56 Seras?), Bactri (*Aur. Vict. Caes.* 1), Aethiopes (*Epit. de Caes.* 1), Daci (*Vir. Ill.* 79. 5), and Medes (*Hor. Odes* 4. 14. 41–3) are reported. For a discussion of the evidence see E. H. Warmington, *Commerce between the Roman Empire and India* (1928), 35–8, and J. Gagé, *op. cit.*, 139–40.

XX. NERO . . . FOEDARUNT: In A.D. 59 Cn. Corbulo captured Tigranocerta and expelled Tiridates, son of the Parthian king, Vologases I, who had governed Armenia since 54 (on Roman-Parthian affairs under Nero see Debevoise, *op. cit.*, 179 ff.). Nero then selected Tigranes V – great-grandson of Archelaus, last King of Cappadocia – to succeed Tiridates (*Joseph. BJ* 2. 222, *AJ* 18. 140; *Tac. Ann.* 14. 26). In 61 Tigranes invaded Adiabene, which King Monobazus defended with the aid of Parthian cavalry. A truce soon was arranged, however, under which Vologases sent an embassy to place before Nero the Parthian claim to Armenia (*Tac. Ann.* 15. 5 f; *Dio.* 62. 20). In violation of this truce, L. Caesenius Paetus, governor of Cappadocia, in 62 crossed the Euphrates with two legions – IV Scythica and XII Fulminata – and was defeated at Rhandeia by Vologases. The negotiated settlement was entirely favourable to the Parthians: Vologases would renew the truce if (1) the Romans withdrew from Armenia, (2) all forts and supplies were surrendered, and (3) Parthian ambassadors were permitted to negotiate the Armenian question in Rome (*Tac. Ann.* 15. 14; *Dio* 62. 21. 1–4 = *Exc. U^m* 12). The report that the Roman army was sent under the yoke is

dismissed as rumour by Tacitus (*Ann.* 15. 15. 1-2), but accepted by others (Suet. *Nero* 39. 1; Eutrop. 7. 14. 4; Oros. 7. 7. 12 – Eutropius and Orosius used Suetonius or some intermediate Suetonian Kaisergeschichte). This ‘rumour’ may be an interpretation of Vologases’ unusual demand that the Romans build a bridge over the Arsianias river as a symbol of their defeat (Tac. *Ann.* 15. 15. 1; Dio 62. 21. 4 = Exc. U^m 12). Vologases’ ambassadors in Rome failed to secure the investiture of Tiridates *in absentia* and negotiations were broken off. Finally, Corbulo marched into Armenia, met with Vologases at Rhandaia, and agreed that Tiridates should receive Armenia, but only from Nero himself (Joseph. *B^J* 2. 379; Tac. *Ann.* 15. 24. 31). Not until 66, however, did Nero invest Tiridates with the kingdom of Armenia (Pliny *HN* 30. 16-17; Suet. *Nero* 13; Dio 63. 1-6 = Xiph. 172). According to Festus, by this act Nero amisit Armeniam.

TRAIANUS . . . ADEMIT (cp. ch. XIV): Around A.D. 110 Osroes, the Parthian king, deposed Tiridates and nominated Axidares as King of Armenia (Dio 68. 17. 1 = Xiph. 235). Unwilling to recognize by inaction a Parthian vassal as King of Armenia, Trajan set out from Rome in 113 to restore Roman ‘rights’ in Armenia. At Athens he was met by an embassy from Osroes, who now requested that his son Parthamasiris succeed Axidares, who had been dethroned. Trajan replied that he would consider their requests when he had reached Syria (Dio 68. 17. 2-18. 1 = Exc. U^s 51). In 114 Trajan captured Arsamosata – in the Armenian district of Sophene – and agreed to receive Parthamasiris at Elegeia. There, Parthamasiris, thinking that Trajan would invest him with Armenia, laid the diadem before the Emperor; Trajan forthwith proclaimed Armenia a Roman province. Parthamasiris was dismissed from the Roman camp; shortly thereafter he was mysteriously murdered (Fronto *Princ. Hist.* 15; Arrian *Parth.* frs. 37-40; Dio 68. 19-20 = Xiph. 235; Eutrop. 8. 3; coins with legend REX PARTHUS [Trajan seated on dais, attended by a prefect, receiving Parthamasiris], Mattingly, *CREBM* III [1936], nos. 511, 524, 1014, 1020, issued between A.D. 112 and 117; for discussion of the evidence see F. A. Lepper, *Trajan’s Parthian War* [1948]).

ALBANIS . . . RECEPIT: The investiture of the Albanian king and the reception of legates from the various tribes probably are represented on coins bearing the legend REGNA ADSIGNATA (Trajan seated on dais; three kings or kings' representatives stand before him: Mattingly, *CREBM* III [1936], nos. 588-9, 613-15, 1043-4, issued between A.D. 112 and 117; discussion of numismatic evidence in R. Göbl, *RhM* N. F. 104, 1 [1961], 70 ff.; cp. Eutrop. 8. 3. 1 Albanis regem dedit. Hiberorum regem et Sauromatarum et Bosphoranorum et Arabum et Osdroenorum et Colchorum in fidem accepit; cp. Jerome *ann.* 102-3, p. 194 [Helm]). Festus' statement that Trajan campaigned against the Osrhoeni and Arabes is not supported elsewhere and may be a distortion of Eutropius (*loc. cit.*). Similarly, his subjugation of the Cardueni (perhaps inhabitants of Gordyene - Baumgartner, *RE* VII. 2 [1912], 1594-5) and Marcomedi (Medes, according to von Gutschmid, *Geschichte Irans* [1888], 143, n. 1) is corroborated by Eutropius (8. 3. 1 - Carduenos, Marcomedos occupavit).

ANTHEMUSIUM . . . ACCESSIT: In 114, Trajan moved against Sporaces, phylarch of Anthemusia, because he had not paid homage along with the tribal princes. After Sporaces fled, Trajan occupied his territory (Arrian *Parth.* frs. 54-6; Dio 68. 21. 1 = Exc. U^s 53). In the same year, Trajan captured Ctesiphon (Dio 68. 28. 2-3 = Xiph. 238; Eutrop. 8. 3. 1). In 116, Erucius Clarus and Julius Alexander, Trajan's lieutenants, captured and burned Seleucia-on-Tigris (Dio 68. 30. 2; Eutrop. 8. 3. 1; coins bearing legend PARTHIA CAPTA: Mattingly *CREBM* III [1936], nos. 603-6, issued A.D. 112/13). Babylon was not taken by force (as Festus and Eutrop. 8. 3. 1 imply), but was acquired after the surrender of Ctesiphon; Trajan wintered there in 115/16 (Arrian *Parth.* fr. 75; Dio 68. 26. 4, 27. 1a, 30. 1).

IN MARI . . . INSTITUIT: The source for this statement probably was Eutropius 8. 3. 2 - in mari Rubro classem instituit, ut per eam Indiae fines vastaret (followed by Jerome *ann.* 103, p. 194 [Helm]; Jord. *Rom.* 268). Lepper (*op. cit.* 159) evidently accepts the location in the Red Sea, but Starr (*Roman Imperial Navy* [2nd ed. 1960], 113) and C. Preaux (*Phoibos* 5 [1950-1], 134) argue that the stated purpose (omitted by Festus) for the

fleet – ut per eam Indiae fines vastaret – could be accomplished best from the Persian Gulf. This alternative interpretation is credible, although we simply do not know what Eutropius and Festus intended.

PROVINCIAE . . . FECUNDATUR (cp. ch. XIV); The formation of Armenia and Mesopotamia as Roman provinces is commemorated on a coin bearing the legend ARMENIA ET MESOPOTAMIA IN POTESTATEM P. R. REDACTAE (Mattingly, *CREBM* III [1936], nos. 1033–40, issued A.D. 116/17; cp. Eutrop. 8. 3. 2). The creation of Assyria is reported also by Eutropius (8. 3. 2) and Jerome (*ann.* 113, p. 196 [Helm]). The identification of Assyria as classical Babylonia (= the royal province of the Parthians, Asorestan) has been put forward persuasively by A. Maricq in *Syria* 36 (1959), 254 ff. On the creation of the Arabian province: Eutrop. 8. 3. 2; Jerome *ann.* 102, p. 197 (Helm); Amm. Marc. 14. 8. 13; for coins bearing legend ARAB. ADQUISIT. see Mattingly, *CREBM* III (1936), nos. 877, 919, 959, 977–81, 997, 1077a [issued A.D. 104–11], 474–6, 1009–11 [issued A.D. 112/17]; cf. C. Preaux, *op. cit.*, 123 ff.

HADRIANUM . . . UOLUIT (cp. ch. XIV): Soon after his accession, Hadrian renounced claim to the provinces of Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria (Fronto *Princ. Hist.* 10 [Loeb]; *vita Hadr.* 5. 3, 21. 11–12; Eutrop. 8. 6. 2; Jerome *ann.* 117, p. 197 [Helm]; Aug. *CD* 4. 29; Jord. *Rom.* 270), and Parthamaspates was made ruler of Osroene (Dio 68. 33, 1 = Xiph. 240; *vita Hadr.* 5. 4 incorrectly Parthamasiris; cf. R. Göbl, *op. cit.*). Festus' denunciation of this withdrawal is borrowed from Eutropius (8. 6. 2 – Qui Traiani gloriae invidens statim provincias tres reliquit) or a common source. A more sober assessment is found in *vita Hadriani* 5. 3: quare omnia trans Euphraten ac Tigrim reliquit, exemplo, ut dicebat, Catonis, qui Macedones liberos pronuntiabit, quia tueri non poterant.

XXI. ANTONINI . . . TENUERUNT: Marcus (= M. Aurelius Antoninus) and Verus (= L. Aurelius Verus) were adopted by Antoninus Pius in A.D. 138 and became joint rulers in 161 (with Festus cp. *vita Hadr.* 24. 2, hi sunt qui postea duo pariter Augusti primi rem publicam gubernaverunt). To seal this arrangement, Marcus married his daughter, Annia Lucilla,

to Verus *c.* 164 (*vita M. Ant.* 7. 7, 9. 4; *vita Ver.* 2. 4; Eutrop. 8. 10. 1).

SED . . . TRIUMPHAUIT (cp. ch. XIV): In 161 the Parthians under Vologases III invaded Syria (Dio 71. 2. 1; *vita M. Ant.* 8. 6; *vita Ver.* 6. 9; Oros. 7. 15. 2); shortly afterwards, Verus arrived in Syria and attempted unsuccessfully to negotiate a settlement. During the next four years, Verus, through his generals, campaigned vigorously against the Parthians: Statius Priscus captured Artaxata, the capital of Armenia, in 163 (*vita M. Ant.* 9. 1; *vita Ver.* 7. 1); in 165, Avidius Cassius besieged and burned Seleucia (Dio 71. 2. 3; *vita Ver.* 8. 3; Eutrop. 8. 10. 2, Seleuciam, Assyriae urbem nobilissimam, cum quadringentis milibus hominum cepit; Amm. Marc. 23. 6. 24; for an assessment of Verus' role in these campaigns see P. Lambrechts, *AC* 3 [1934], 192 ff.). Before 166 Verus returned to Rome and celebrated a triumph with Marcus (*vita M. Ant.* 12. 8; *vita Ver.* 7. 9; Eutrop. 8. 10. 2; Jerome *ann.* 165, p. 205 [Helm]; Oros. 7. 15. 2; coins bearing legend PARTHICUS MAXIMUS in Mattingly, *CREBM* IV (1940), p. 437 ff. [Verus], p. 440 ff. [Marcus]; see E. Napp *De rebus imperatore M. Aurelio Antonino in Oriente Gestis* [1879], 12 ff.).

SEUERUS . . . COGNOMINATUS: To punish the allies of his former rival, Pescennius Niger, Septimius Severus crossed the Euphrates in A.D. 195 and established headquarters at Nisibis. Through his generals – Lateranus, Candidus, and Laetus – he ravaged the countryside around Nisibis and subjugated the Adiabeni and Scenite Arabs; after these victories Severus took the titles Adiabenicus and Arabicus and re-established the province of Arabia (Dio 75. 1. 2–3 = Exc. U^s 69, 2–3 = Xiph. 303, 3. 2 = Xiph. 304; *vita Sev.* 9. 9–11; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 20. 14–17; Eutrop. 8. 18. 4; Oros. 7. 17. 3; coins bearing the legend ARAB . ADIAB in *CREBM* V (1950), nos. 79, 107–9, 121, 131–3, 157–8, 326, issued A.D. 194/7; Mattingly, *ibid.*, lxxxviii–lxxxix, suggests that the concurrent appearance of coins bearing the double titles PARTHICUS . ADIABENICUS . PARTHICUS . ARABICUS [nos. 86, 118–21, 555–7, 563] implies ‘that the Parthian king was behind these other enemies of Rome’; *CIL* 8. 306, 6. 954 = Dessau 417; for discussion of the evidence see M. Platnauer, *Life and Reign of the Emperor L.*

Septimius Severus [1918], 74 ff.). In 197/8, after Vologases IV had overrun Adiabene, Severus once again crossed the Euphrates, occupied Seleucia and Babylon, and sacked Ctesiphon (Herodian 3. 9. 9–11; Dio 75. 9 = Xiph. 308; *vita Sev.* 16. 1–2; modern discussion by G. J. Murphy, *The Reign of the Emperor L. Sept. Severus* [1945], 24 ff.). He then assumed the title Parthicus Maximus in imitation of Trajan (*CIL* 3. 205; coins bearing legend VICT. PARTHICAE [A.D. 197–8] and L. SEPT. SEV. AUG. IMP. XI PART. MAX [A.D. 198–200] in Mattingly, *CREBM* v (1950), pp. 175 ff.). Festus may have obtained his information from Eutropius (8. 18. 1–4). On Septimius' origin – natione Afer – see M. Hammond, *HSCP* 51 (1940), 146ff.

ANTONINUS . . . SEPULTUS: According to Herodian (4. 10. 1, 11. 7), in 216 Caracalla asked to marry the daughter of Artabanus V, King of Media, and was rejected; later, Artabanus relented and agreed to the marriage. Caracalla then crossed the Euphrates, attacked the Parthians during a celebration in his honour, and ravaged the countryside. That Caracalla sought to join the two empires by marriage and to this end corresponded with Artabanus V is verified by Dio. 78. 1. 1 = Xiph. 337. Caracalla's victory over the Parthians in 216 is attested independently on coins (*vita Caracal.* 6. 6; coins bearing legend VICT. PART [A.D. 217] in Mattingly, *CREBM* v (1950), nos. 89–90, 197–200; for a discussion of the evidence see W. Reusch, *Der Historische Wert der Caracallavita*, *Klio Beiheft* 24, N. F. Heft 11 [1931], 47 ff.). On 8 April 217 Caracalla was assassinated at Macrinus' orders between Carrhae and Edessa (*vita Caracal.* 6. 6; Dio 78. 5. 4–5; Joh. Ant. 147, *FHG* IV, 597; Herodian 4. 13. 3–8; Eutrop. 8. 20. 2 moliens adversum Parthos expeditionem; *Epit. de Caes.* 21. 6–7; Oros. 7. 18. 2 contra Parthos bellum moliens; W. Reusch, 50 ff.; E. Hohl, 'Das Ende Caracallas', *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia* 2 [1950], 276 ff.; on the burial of Caracalla and for a discussion of the source(s) used by Festus see above, pp. 89–90).

XXII. AURELIUS . . . UICIT: M. Aurelius Severus Alexander, still quite young, became sole emperor in A.D. 221/2 (Herodian 5. 8. 10 κομίδῃ νέος; Eutrop. 8. 23 iuvenis admodum). Contemporaneous with his accession was the collapse of the Parthian Empire, which was replaced by the Sassanid dynasty

in the person of Ardashir I (= Artaxerxes = Xerxes: Dio 80. 3. 2 = Xiph. 356; Herodian 6. 2. 1-3). Ardashir, who boasted that he would restore the ancient Persian kingdom, soon acquired control over Mesopotamia and Armenia and threatened Syria. To counter this serious threat to Rome's Eastern empire Severus Alexander, having raised an army in Rome and Illyricum, arrived in Antioch in 231. After some reverses he defeated Ardashir and recovered Mesopotamia (Herodian 6. 4. 2-7 says that Alexander, upon learning of the German threat in the west and after suffering severe losses, signed a truce with Ardashir, who had disbanded his army [this account is rejected by the author of the *vita Sev. Alex.* 57. 2. 3, cp. 55. 1; for discussion of this divergence see A. Jardé, *Études critiques sur la vie et le règne de Sévère Alexandre* (1925), 83-5, who considers the rejection 'une addition postérieure' designed to clear Severus' record]; cf. Eutrop. 8. 23).

HIC . . . CONSULTOREM: Ulpian held several offices under Alexander, among which was magister libellorum, one of the four public scrinia (*vita Sev. Alex.* 26. 6; *vita Pesc. Niger* 7. 6; Eutrop. 8. 23 – adsessorem habuit vel scrinii magistrum Ulpianum, iuris conditorem). On the source(s) of Festus see above, p. 90.

DE PERSIS . . . TRIUMPHAUIT: The triumph was celebrated at Rome in 233 (*vita Sev. Alex.* 56. 1).

SUB GORDIANO . . . DEDUXERUNT: In A.D. 241 Ardashir died and was succeeded by his son Sapor, who immediately invaded Syria and captured Antioch. In the following year Gordian III, accompanied by his praefectus praetorio Timesitheus, arrived in Syria with a large army and systematically recovered Carrhae, Resaina, and Nisibis (*vita Gord.* 26. 5-6, 27. 2; Eutrop. 9. 2. 2-3; Zos. 1. 18. 2; Amm. Marc. 23. 5. 17; an excellent discussion of the evidence is provided by P. W. Townsend *YCS* IV [1934], 126 ff.). While preparing to besiege Ctesiphon, Timesitheus died (*vita Gord.* 28. 1 – Misitheus [sic], quantum plerique dicunt, artibus Philippi . . . ut alii, morbo extinctus est; Zos. 1. 18. 2); Gordian then appointed Philip the Arabian as praefectus praetorio. Not satisfied with bureaucratic promotions, Philip immediately began to stir the soldiers

against Gordian; in the end, he had sufficient strength to order the death of the Emperor and to seize command for himself (*vita Gord.* 29. 2–30. 8; *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 27. 8; *Eutrop.* 9. 2. 3; *Epit. de Caes.* 27. 2; *Amm. Marc.* 23. 5. 17; cf. the trilingual *Res Gestae Divi Saporis* 6–9 [text, French translation and extensive discussion by A. Maricq in *Syria* 35 (1958), 295 ff.] which records a battle between Sapor and Gordian at Misikhè, in Asôrestân; for discussion of the evidence see Townsend, *ibid.*, 131, and S. I. Oost, *CPh* 53 [1958], 106–7). To Rome messengers were despatched announcing that Gordian had died from natural causes (*vita Gord.* 31. 2; *Zos.* 1. 19. 1). The soldiers evidently erected a monument near Circesium commemorating his death, but his place of burial – whether in Rome or near Circesium – is not certain (*vita Gord.* 34. 2; *Eutrop.* 9. 2. 3; *Epit. de Caes.* 27. 3; *Amm. Marc.* 23. 5. 7, 23. 5. 17; on Festus' source(s) see above, pp. 90–1. Hohl's suggestion (*Klio* 27 [1934], 158, n. 4) that Gordian's ashes were transferred to Rome and only 'ein symbolisches Begräbnis' deposited in the tumulus seems the most probable explanation.

XXIII. VALERIANI . . . CONSENUIT: P. Licinius Valerianus succeeded Gallus in A.D. 253 and created his son, Gallienus, Augustus and joint ruler of the empire (*Zos.* 1. 30. 1; cp. *Eutrop.* 9. 7). In 259 while campaigning against the Persians, Valerian was captured by Sapor and ended his life in captivity (*Aur. Vict. Caes.* 32. 5; *Eutrop.* 9. 7 *captus apud Parthos ignobili servitute consenuit*; *Zos.* 1. 36. 2 *μεγίστην αἰσχύνην . . . τῷ Ῥωμαίων ὀνόματι*; *Res Gestae Divi Saporis* 19–25 [Maricq, *op. cit.*, 310–13]; *Jerome ann.* 258, p. 220 [Helm] Valerianus . . . a Sapore Persarum rege capitur ibique servitute miserabili consenescit). I have followed the chronology proposed by G. Lopuszanski, *Cahiers de l'Institut d'études Polonaises en Belgique* 9 (1951); for the most recent analysis – with full bibliography – of the chronological problems of the period see T. Pekáry, *Historia* 11 (1962), 123 ff.

SUB GALLIENO . . . PENETRASSET: After the capture of Valerian, Septimius Odenathus collected an army, assumed the title of King of Palmyra, and defeated Sapor (*vitae Tyr. Trig.* 15. 2; cp. *vita Gall.* 10. 1; *Jerome ann.* 266, p. 221 [Helm] collecta

agrestium manu; Oros. 7. 22. 12 collecta agresti manu; Petr. Patr. fr. 10 in *FHG* 4. 187 reports that Odenathus first offered his services to the Persians, but was rejected; Jord. *Rom.* 290 collecta rusticorum manu; cp. Procop. *Pers.* 2. 5, where O. is called ἄρχοντας τῶν Σαρακηνῶν). Gallienus rewarded Odenathus with the title dux and entrusted to him the command of Roman armies in the East (Zon. 12. 23. 4; L. Homo, *Essai sur le règne de l'Empereur Aurélien*, 47, n. 1 suggests that his official title was Στρατηγὸς Ῥωμαίων). During the next few years (262–4) Odenathus captured Nisibis and Carrhae, reconquered Mesopotamia, and penetrated as far as Ctesiphon (*vitae Tyr. Trig.* 15. 2–3; *vita Gall.* 10. 3, 6, 12. 1; Eutrop. 9. 10; Jerome *ann.* 266, p. 221 [Helm]; Oros. 7. 22. 12; Zos. 1. 39. 1–2 he penetrated to Ctesiphon οὐχ ἅπαξ ἀλλὰ καὶ δεύτερον; Jord. *Rom.* 290). By his actions the frontier of Septimius Severus was re-established. For a discussion of Festus' source(s) see above, p. 92 f.

XXIV. AURELIANI . . . DUXIT: Odenathus was assassinated in A.D. 266 or 267 and was succeeded by his son Vaballathus. Gallienus, however, did not transfer to Vaballathus the titles held by Odenathus – he was confirmed as King of Palmyra only. Nonetheless, Vaballathus and Zenobia were de facto masters of the Eastern provinces, as they demonstrated by defeating Gallienus' general Heraclianus (*vita Gall.* 13. 5). During the reign of Claudius Gothicus, in 269/70, a Palmyrene army under Zabdas overran Egypt and most of Asia Minor (*vita Claud.* 11. 1–2; Zos. 1. 44). In 270 Aurelian restored to Vaballathus the titles of Odenathus (for the evidence, coins and papyri, see L. Homo, *op. cit.*, 67, n. 1), thus tacitly recognizing the Palmyrene conquests. Even this concession did not suffice: in 271 Vaballathus began issuing coins with the title Augustus (Homo, 82, n. 1); this challenge to Imperial authority could not go unpunished. While his commander, Probus, reconquered Egypt (*vita Prob.* 9. 5), Aurelian arrived in Asia Minor, defeated a Palmyrene contingent at Tyana (*vita Aurel.* 22. 5–24, 9; Zos. 1. 50. 2) and marched south towards Antioch. In 272 at Immae – about 42 kilometres east of Antioch, on the Beroea–Antioch road – he engaged and defeated the Palmyrene cavalry, thus destroying all resistance before Antioch and forcing Zenobia to evacuate the city (Jerome *ann.* 273, p. 222

[Helm] – Zenobia apud Immas haut longe ab Antiochia vincitur, quae occiso Odenato marito orientis tenebat imperium; cp. Eutrop. 9. 13. 2 – Zenobiam quoque, quae occiso Odenatho marito Orientem tenebat, haud longe ab Antiochia sine gravi proelio cepit; Zos. 1. 50 on the Orontes; see the excellent reconstruction by G. Downey, *TAPhA* 81 [1950], 57 ff.). Aurelian then occupied Antioch and began preparations for a final decisive campaign against Zenobia. After a brief skirmish with a remnant of the Palmyrene army at Daphne, a suburb of Antioch (*vita Aurel.* 25. 1 – recepta Tyana Antiochiam . . . brevi apud Daphnem certamine obtinuit: the chronology of this report, which omits the battle at Immae, is not supported by Zosimus 1. 52, who mentions the skirmish in connection with Aurelian's journey from Antioch to Emesa; for a discussion see Downey, *loc. cit.*), Aurelian overtook and defeated Zenobia at Emesa (*vita Aurel.* 25. 2–3; Zos. 1. 52–54). Zenobia, who escaped from Emesa, was apprehended finally at Palmyra (*vita Aurel.* 28. 1–3; Zos. 55. 2–56. 2; Eutrop. 9. 13. 2 incorrectly says that she was captured haud longe ab Antiochia; cp. Oros. 7. 23. 4). In 274 Aurelian returned to Rome and celebrated a triumph (*vita Aurel.* 32. 4–33. 4 [Zenobia] cum eo urbem ingressa est victa et triumphata; Eutrop. 9. 13. 2 ingressusque Romam nobilem triumphum quasi receptor Orientis Occidentisque egit praecedentibus curram Tetrico [whom Aurelian had defeated in Gaul] et Zenobia; Jerome *ann.* 274; Oros. 7. 23. 5; Zos. 1. 61, but cp. 1. 59 where Zosimus notes that Zenobia died en route to Rome); on the source(s) used by Festus, whose account is correct but incomplete, see above, p. 93.

CARI . . . INTERIIT: M. Aurelius Carus, leaving Carinus in charge of the West, set out for the East with his son Numerian in A.D. 282. He invaded Persia and captured Cochen – quam Seleuciam nominant, Amm. Marc. 24. 5. 3 – and Ctesiphon, where he died (*vita Cari* 8. 1–2; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 38. 3–5; Eutrop. 9. 18. 1; *Epit. de Caes.* 38. 3; Oros. 7. 24. 4; Jord. *Rom.* 294; for a discussion of Festus' source(s) see above, pp. 93 f.).

XXV. MAXIMIANUS . . . PURPURATUS: Narses usurped the Persian throne in A.D. 293 and sought to reconquer the territory – Armenia and Mesopotamia – ceded to Rome by Bahram

II ten years earlier. In 297 he occupied Armenia (Amm. Marc. 23. 5. 11), Osrhoene and Syria (Zon. 12. 31). From the Danube area Galerius (= Maximianus Caesar) was sent to protect the Eastern frontier. Between Carrhae and Callinicum he encountered a superior Persian force and was defeated (Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 39. 34; Eutrop. 9. 24; Oros. 7. 25. 9; Theophanes *Chron.* A. M. 5793; for an analysis of the Persian War see W. Ensslin, *SBAW*, phil-hist. Abt., Heft. 1 (1942) pp. 35 ff.; cp. ch. XIV uictis prima congressione Romanis). The literary tradition concerning the 'humiliation' of Galerius – ut ante carpentum eius per aliquot milia passuum cucurrerit purpuratus (cp. Eutrop. 9. 24 Pulsis igitur et ad Diocletianum profectus cum ei in itinere occurrisset, tanta insolentia a Diocletiano fertur exceptus, ut per aliquot passuum milia purpuratus tradatur ad vehiculum cucurrisse; Jerome *ann.* 301, p. 227 [Helm] Galerius Maximianus victus a Narseo ante carpentum Diocletiani purpuratus cucurrit [cp. Jord. *Rom.* 301]; Oros. 7. 25. 9 ut per aliquot milia passuum purpuratus ante vehiculum eius cucurrisse referatur; Theophanes *Chron.* A. M. 5793) – has been examined by W. Seston (*REA* 42 [1940], 515 ff.). When Galerius entered Antioch with Diocletian he did not sit beside the emperor in the carpentum, but walked alongside – a custom commonly observed by the Caesars during the Tetrarchy (e.g. in the ceremony of the investiture). Seston suggests that Festus and others incorrectly interpreted Galerius' observance of custom as punishment for failure in the Persian campaign. As evidence Seston points to the passage in Ammianus (14. 11. 10): Quibus subserebat non adeo vetus exemplum, quod Diocletiano et eius collegae [Maximiano], ut apparitores Caesares non resides sed ultro citroque discurrentes, obtemperabant, et in Syria Augusti vehiculum irascentis, per spatium mille passuum fore pedes antegressus est Galerius purpuratus. Seston, attributing this passage to 'la Chronique Imperiale' (?), concludes that et in . . . purpuratus is an interpolation suggested by apparitores. This hypothesis is quite unnecessary. Ammianus is reporting an exchange of letters between Constantius and Gallus in which the Emperor urged Gallus to join him in Milan. Ammianus was in Milan at the time (14. 10. 5) and could have learned of this correspondence first-hand – even if he had not read the

letter, he could have known its contents from members of the court. Moreover, when he wrote he must have been familiar with the 'humiliation' tradition – he had read Eutropius, Festus, and/or their source – and could have glossed apparitores himself. Even if the passage is an interpolation, the 'humiliation' tradition is not disproved. In short, I am not convinced that Ammianus is evidence for Seston's hypothesis. On the other hand, Seston's argument that the humiliation tradition originated from a misinterpretation of a common rite of the Tetrarchy is entirely acceptable.

ET CUM . . . RESERVATAE: Galerius spent the summer of 297 levying troops for another campaign against the Persians. Part of the recruits probably were obtained in Illyricum – limitanei Daciae (cp. Eutrop. 9. 25. 1 per Illyricum Moesiamque contractis copiis; Oros. 7. 25. 10). He then invaded Armenia Minor and defeated Narses in the Araxes Valley (Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 39. 35; Eutrop. 9. 25. 1; Jerome *ann.* 302, p. 227 [Helm]; Faustus of Byzantium 3. 21, *FHG* V²; Oros. 7. 25. 10–11; cp. ch. XIV secundo autem conflictu superato rege Narseo; on the capture and treatment of the family: Eutrop. 9. 25. 1; Petr. Patr. fr. 13, *FHG* IV. 188; Faustus of Byzantium *loc. cit.*; cp. ch. XIV).

PRO QUA . . . PERDURAUIT: In 298 Diocletian and Galerius dictated peace terms to Narses at Nisibis; Festus (cp. ch. XIV) reproduces two of the clauses – that Mesopotamia and the quinque gentium trans Tigridem be restored (Petr. Patr. fr. 14, *FHG* IV. 188 f.: (1) τὴν Ἰντηληνὴν μετὰ Σοφηνῆς καὶ Ἀρζανηνὴν μετὰ Καρδουηνῶν καὶ Ζαβδικηνῆς Ῥωμαίους ἔχειν, (2) καὶ τὸν Τίγριν ποταμὸν ἑκατέρας πολιτείας Ὀροθέσιν εἶναι, (3) Ἀρμενίαν δὲ Ζίνθα τὸ κάστρον ἐν μεθορίῳ τῆς Μηδικῆς κείμενον ὀρίζειν, (4) τὸν δὲ Ἰβηρίας βασιλέα τῆς οἰκείας βασιλείας τὰ σύμβολα Ῥωμαῖος ὀφείλειν, (5) εἶναι δὲ τόπον τῶν συναλλαγμάτων Νίσιβιν τὴν πόλιν παρακειμένην τῷ Τίγριδι; on the quinque regiones Transstigritanas – Amm. Marc. 25. 7. 9 Arzanenam et Moxoenam et Zabdicenam itidemque Rehimenam et Carduenam). The amusing remark that the Persae non modo armis, sed etiam moribus Romanos superiores esse confessi sunt is sensibly replaced by pace facta in ch. XIV. Similarly, in ch. XIV, Festus is much more explicit concerning the duration

of the peace of 298 – *Quae condicio foederis in tempus diualis Constantii reseruata durauit.*

XXVI. CONSTANTINUS . . . MERERENTUR: When Sapor II, son of Hormisdas II, became King of Persia, he repudiated the treaty of 298. In direct violation of the agreement, in 334 he abducted Diran, the Armenian monarch. Constantine then nominated as King his nephew Hannibalianus, who drove the Persians out of Armenia in 336 and began preparations for an extensive campaign. Before any action could be taken, however, Constantine died on 22 May 337 near Nicomedia (on abduction of Diran – Faustus of Byzantium 3. 20, *FHG* V² 229–31; Julian *Or.* 1. 20D; on Hannibalianus – *Epit. de Caes.* 41. 20; on a Persian embassy – Lib. *Or.* 59. 72 f.; on death of Constantine – Euseb. *vita Const.* 4. 57 ff.; Anon. Vales. 35 item Constantinus cum bellum pararet in Persas in suburbano Constantinopolitano . . . [interpolation of Oros. 7. 28. 31?] . . . obiit; Oros. 7. 28. 31). ‘De Gothis victoria’ is a reference to the defeat of the Goths in 332 by Caesar Constantine II (Euseb. *vita Const.* 4. 5; Anon. Vales. 31; Eutrop. 10. 7. 1; Jerome *ann.* 332, p. 233 [Helm]; Cons. Const. *ann.* 332 [Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* I 234]; Oros. 7. 28. 29; coins bearing legend DEBELLATORI GENTIUM BARBARUM and VICTORIA GOTHICA, J. Maurice, *Numismatique Constantinienne* I [1908], 484–5).

XXVII. CONSTANTIUS . . . PRAEBERENT: According to Festus nine major battles between Persians and Romans were fought during the reign of Constantius (cp. Jerome *ann.* 348, p. 236 [Helm]; Oros. 7. 29. 6). Only two of these were under the personal direction of the Emperor. The battles were: Sisarvena, Singarena I and II (Constantius present at the second), Sicgarena (Constantius present?), Amida, Nisibis I, II, III, Narasarensi, Eliensi prope Singaram (Constantius present). If the last is identified as Singarena I or II or Narasarensi, then Festus’ addition is correct; otherwise we have ten engagements.

In 337, shortly after the death of Constantine, Sapor II invaded Mesopotamia and besieged for two months without success the fortified city of Nisibis (= Nisibis I, Lib. *Or.* 59. 74; Jerome *ann.* 338, p. 234 [Helm]; additional sources – Chronicon Paschale, Theophanes, Chronicon Miscellaneum, Chronicon

Iacobi Edesseni – have been conveniently assembled by J. Bidez, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte* [Leipzig, 1913], 210–11 [hereafter cited as Bidez]). In the following year Sapor arranged a truce with Constans, who had rushed from Pannonia to Syria, by which he released the captured Armenian royal family and agreed that the Romans should nominate a new Armenian ruler. The Romans in 338 installed their vassal, Arsaces, son of Diran (Julian *Or.* I. 20D; Faustus of Byzantium 3. 21, 4. 1, *FHG* V², 235 ff.). Hostilities were renewed in 344 (348?), however, when Sapor crossed the Tigris, moved to a position near Singara in Mesopotamia, and engaged the Romans under Constantius. Neither army could claim victory and both suffered heavy losses. Festus locates this conflict at Eliensi prope Singara and his description accords with that found in other sources (Julian *Or.* I. 23–25A terms this τὸν πρὸ τῶν Συγγάρων πόλεμον, reports the pursuit of Sapor against Constantius' orders, and says that the armies fought through the night and finally withdrew at daybreak; Eutrop. 10. 10. 1 quod [proelium] apud Singaram haud dubiam victoriam ferocia militum amisit, qui pugnam seditiose et stolide contra rationem belli die iam praecipiti poposcerunt; Amm. Marc. 18. 5. 7 apud Hileiam et Singaram, ubi acerrima illa nocturna concertatione pugnatum est, nostrorum copiis ingenti strage confossis; Jerome *ann.* 348. p. 236 [Helm] – Bellum Persicum nocturnum apud Singaram, in quo haut dubiam victoriam militum stoliditate perdidimus. Neque vero ullum Constantio ex VIII gravissimis proelis contra Persas bellum fuit [gravius]; Theophanes A. M. 5835 = A.D. 343/4; Cons. Const. *ann.* 348 [Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* I, 236]; Socr. *HE* 2. 25; for discussion of evidence see J. B. Bury, *Byz* 5 [1896], 302 ff.). According to P. Peeters (*Bulletin de la Classe des lettres de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, 5^e série, xvii [1931], 43 ff.), Narasarensi, Nararensi, Narnarensi, or Narasanensi = Hileia; which is situated at the foot of Djebel Singar, 'sur un cours d'eau qui s'appelle encore aujourd'hui le Nahr Ghîrân. A n'en pas douter, c'est cet ancien vocable indigène qui se cache sous la leçon hésitante du texte du Rufius Festus.' The death of Narseus, which occurred at Narasarensi according to Festus, is reported also by Julian *Or.* I, 24D and Theophanes A. M. 5815. In 346 Sapor besieged Nisibis for

three months in vain and withdrew on the arrival of Constantius (=Nisibis II; S. Ephraem. *Carm. Nisib.* 13. 15-17, p. 98 [Bickell]; Jerome *ann.* 346, p. 236 [Helm]; Theophanes A. M. 5838; cf. P. Peeters, *Analecta Bollandiana* 38 [1920], 285 ff.). Again, in 350, Sapor remained before Nisibis for three months, but could not capture the city (=Nisibis III; S. Ephraem, *Carm. Nisib.* 2-3, pp. 75-81 [Bickell; see also commentary, p. 14 ff.]; Julian *Or.* I, 27A-28D, II 64B-66D; Theophanes A. M. 5841; Philostorgius 3. 23 [Bidez, p. 50; cf. also pp. 215-16]; cp. Amm. Marc. 19. 9. 9). In 359 Sapor invaded Mesopotamia with a large army and, after a siege of seventy-three days, captured and destroyed the fortified city of Amida (Diarbekir) on the upper Tigris. He soon withdrew from the area, however, and Arasces, who had aided Sapor in the siege, defected to the Romans once again (Cons. Const. *ann.* 358; S. Ephraem. *Carm. Nisib.* 4-12, p. 81-97 [Bickell; cf. commentary p. 17]; Amm. Marc. 18. 9-19. 9; Faustus of Byzantium 4. 20, *FHG* V² 256-8). Sapor then crossed the Tigris and advanced against Singara, which fell after several days (Amm. Marc. 19. 20. 6 reports that Sapor entered the city near the round tower unde reseratem urbem obsidio superiore [cp. 18. 5. 7] docuimus [in a lost book]). He captured Bezabde (Phaenicha) on the Tigris (Amm. Marc. 20. 7. 1-16), besieged Virta (Birtha) unsuccessfully (Amm. Marc. 20. 7. 17), and withdrew into his own territory. The value of Ammianus' report of these campaigns is discussed by L. Dillemann, *Syria* 38 (1961), 102 ff.

Thus, Festus' account is substantiated for the most part. Two battles, however, are not accounted for—Sisarvena ac Sicgarena. The similarity between these names and Singarena suggests a possible scribal error; indeed, the location of Sisarvena (= Sisara? Amm. Marc. 18. 6. 8) and Sicgarena cannot be determined. Yet, these must not be deleted from the text, for they are rendered necessary by Festus' addition — Marte nouiens decertatum est.

XXVIII. IULIANUS . . . EFFLAUIT: Julian began his campaign against Sapor in March 363 (the expedition is discussed by J. Bidez, *La vie de l'Empereur Julien* [1930], 315 ff., and L. Dillemann, *Syria* 38 [1961], 115 ff.). At Carrhae he entrusted some of his army to Sebastian and Procopius and commanded

ut rege sociarentur Arsace, cumque eo per Corduenam et Moxoenam, Chiliocomo uberi Mediae tractu, partibusque aliis praestricto cursu vastatis, apud Assyrios adhuc agenti sibi concurrerent, necessitatum articulis adfuturi (Amm. Marc. 23. 3. 5 puts number of men transferred at 30,000; Magnus of Carrhae, *FHG* IV. 5, 16,000; Zos. 3. 12. 5, 18,000). With the rest of the army Julian marched south along the Euphrates, accompanied by his fleet (Amm. Marc. 23. 3. 9, mille erant onerariae naves, quinquaginta aliae bellatrices, totidemque ad compaginandos necessariae pontes; Magnus of Carrhae *loc. cit.*, 1250; Zos. 3. 13. 2, 6000 troops and more than 50 military vessels). During the march he captured many fortified camps and besieged a great many towns (Magnus of Carrhae *loc. cit.* πολλά κάστρα Περσικά; Socrates *HE* 3. 21 πολλὰς κώμας καὶ φρούρια; Eutrop. 10. 16. 1 aliquot oppida et castella Persarum in deditionem accepit vel vi expugnavit). After he had captured Seleucia (Amm. Marc. 24. 6. 4-17; Zos. 3. 23. 3-4), Julian began the siege of Ctesiphon, but soon realized that the fortress was impregnable and withdrew his forces (Amm. Marc. 24. 7. 1-2; Magnus of Carrhae *FHG* IV, 5-6; Socrates *loc. cit.*). He then rashly decided to burn the fleet and invade the hinterland (Amm. Marc. 24. 7. 4-6; Aug. *CD* 5. 21; Zos. 3. 26. 3). The Persians thwarted his plans by burning their crops and fields and continually harassed the army as it marched through the scorched countryside. In a skirmish with the Persian cavalry on 26 June 363 Julian was wounded and died during the night (Eutrop. 16. 2; Amm. Marc. 25. 3; Zos. 3. 29. 1; Socrates *loc. cit.*; Cons. Const. *ann.* 363 [Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* I, 240]). A separate tradition, which Festus reproduces, reports that Julian and his army were led into a desert by a Persian guide; in this wasteland Julian was wounded in an ambush and died (Magnus of Carrhae *FHG* 5-6, two guides; *Epit. de Caes.* 43. 2, a transfuga quodam in insidias deductus; Jerome *ann.* 363, p. 243 [Helm] a quodam simulato perfuga ad deserta perductus, cum fame et siti apostatam perdidisset exercitum et inconsultius a suorum erraret agminibus, ab obvio forte hostium equite conto ilia perfossus interiit anno aetatis XXXII; Philostorgius 7. 15 [Bidez 100-101], an old man, discharged by the Persians, was their guide; on the Christian legends concern-

ing the death of Julian, see N. H. Baynes, *JRS* 27 [1937], 22 ff.). This looks suspiciously like an adaptation of the story concerning the death of Crassus (ch. XVII).

XXIX. IOUIANUS . . . ADQUIEUIT: After Secundus Salutius, Julian's *praefectus praetorio*, had refused to accept the vote which made him Emperor, Flavius Jovianus – who held the highest rank among the *protectores domestici* – was chosen to succeed Julian. He continued the march west, but lack of supplies forced him to agree to terms set forth by Sapor: he demanded (1) that Rome should surrender a large portion of Mesopotamia, including the cities of Singara and Nisibis (but without their inhabitants); (2) that most of Armenia, alienated in 298, be returned to the Persians; (3) that Rome should promise not to interfere in the internal affairs of Armenia; (4) that annual tribute be paid the Persians in return for maintenance of fortifications in the Caucasus; and (5) that this treaty should remain in force for thirty years (Eutrop. 10. 17. 1; Jerome *ann.* 364, p. 243 [Helm]; Amm. Marc. 25. 7. 9–14; Faustus of Byzantium 4. 21 in *FHG* V², 258 ff.; Zos. 3. 30. 2–31. 2; Socrates *HE* 3. 22; Sozomen *HE* 6. 3; Jord. *Rom.* 306). That Festus should terminate his narrative with this shameful event seems utterly inappropriate – scarcely a report to inspire Valens, who was preparing for a new Persian campaign. Festus' choice, however, is easily explained: he ran out of material. During the reign of Jovian's successor, Valens, the Persian frontier had been relatively quiet. Unless Festus turned to domestic or non-Persian matters – which he did not discuss from ch. XV – there simply was nothing further to report.

APPENDIX

THE PROVINCIAL LISTS

THAT we possess a great wealth of first-hand written evidence for the fourth century is well known. Not the least important of these sources are the provincial lists compiled by the Roman chancery, which document the radical and repeated physical reorganization of the Empire from Diocletian to Theodosius. These lists, however, are neither homogeneous nor complete in themselves. To supplement and corroborate these we must draw upon independent evidence provided by Imperial rescripts, the subscription lists of bishops attending Church councils, and incidental references to provinces or groups of provinces in literary sources and inscriptions. To attempt here an examination of all the evidence relating to the provincial organization of the Empire in the fourth century is unnecessary; my purpose is merely to assess the accuracy of the provincial lists produced by Festus. To this end Festus' lists are compared with those found in the *Laterculus Veronensis*, the *Notitia Galliarum*, the *Laterculus Polemii Silvii*, and the *Notitia Dignitatum*.

The *Laterculus Veronensis*, which Mommsen¹ brought to the attention of scholars in 1862, is of first importance. Unlike *Not. Dign.* – which includes a survey of the military, political, and economic organization of the Empire, as well as provincial lists – this is simply a list of the Roman provinces, which are enrolled under the twelve dioceses of the Empire. Scholars have agreed generally that the list reflects the provincial structure of the Empire in the early fourth century, but have differed concerning the precise date of composition.² Rather than discuss

¹ Mommsen published the text with extensive commentary in his article, 'Verzeichniss der römischen Provinzen aufgesetzt um 297', *Abhandl. der Berliner Akademie der Wiss.*, phil-hist. Kl. (1862), 489 ff. = *Ges. Schr.* v (1908), 561 ff.

² In addition to Mommsen's article, the most important studies are: C. W. Keyes, 'The Date of the *Laterculus Veronensis*', *CPh* 11 (1916), 196 ff.; J. B. Bury, 'The

the validity of their individual conclusions, I have reproduced the provincial lists contained in the *Laterculus* together with some of the evidence which may be of value in establishing the date of composition.

Since the *Breviarium* was written around 369/70, we may infer that the provincial lists produced by Festus reflect the organization of the Empire at that time. To determine the accuracy of his composite *verzeichnis*, however, is rather difficult. Although he furnished ostensibly complete lists for the dioceses of Africa (ch. IV), Spain (ch. V), Gaul and Britain (ch. VI), Illyricum and Macedonia (ch. VIII), and Thrace (ch. IX), he provides only a haphazard register for the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, Oriens, and Egypt (chs. X–XIV) and no list at all for Italy.

The provincial lists found in the *Notitia Galliarum*, *Laterculus Polemii Silvii*, and *Notitia Dignitatum* reflect the organization of the Empire at the end of the fourth century and/or the beginning of the fifth century. I have not attempted to examine here the evidence concerning the date of composition for each of these lists; it will be sufficient to demonstrate that these were compiled after 369/70 and do not invalidate Festus' lists.

The following provincial lists (p. 156) are reproduced with some modifications from the convenient edition by Otto Seeck (*Not. Dign.* [Berlin, 1876]).

In *Not. Dign.* and *Pol. Silv.* (also *Amm. Marc.* 22. 16) provinces 1–6 are included in the dioecesis Aegypti, which first appears in a rescript of 8 March 383 (*CTh* 12. 1. 97). Festus, on the other hand (ch. XIII), treats the Egyptian provinces as part of the dioecesis Orientis, as does *Veron.* This union is confirmed by a rescript issued in 370 or 373 (*CTh* 12. 1. 63) in which the Count of Oriens is called upon to enforce compulsory

Provincial List of Verona', *JRS* 13 (1923), 127 ff.; E. Schwartz, 'Über die Bischofslisten der Synoden von Chalkedon, Nicaea und Konstantinopel', *ABAW* N. F. 13 (1937), 79–82; A. H. M. Jones, 'The Date and Value of the Verona List', *JRS* 44 (1954), 21 ff. A. H. M. Jones' monumental study, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602* – which contains a comprehensive examination of the *Notitia Dignitatum* (Appendix II) and a tabulation of the Roman provinces based on all the provincial registers compiled between A.D. 284 and 602 – was published after I had completed my analysis of Festus' provincial lists. Appendix III, which differs from my examination in purpose and scope, provides some new information regarding the Dioecesis Pontica – this I have cited in my notations.

Dioecesis Orientis

	Veron.	Pol. Silv.	Not. Dign.
1	Libia superior	Libia pentapolis	Libya superior
2	Libia inferior	Libia sicca	Libya inferior
3	Thebais	Thebaida	Thebais
4	Aegyptus Iovia	Aegyptus	Aegyptus
5	Aegyptus Herculia	Augustamnis	[Augustamnica]
6		Archadia	Arcadia
7	Arabia	[Arabia]	[Arabia]
8	item Arabia		
9	Augusta Libanensis		Foenice Libani
10	Palestina	Siria Palestina	Palaestina
11			Palaestina secunda
12			Palaestina salutaris
13	Fenice	Siria Phoenice	Foenice
14	Syria Coele	Siria Coele	Syria
15			Syria salutaris
16	Augusta Euphraten- sis	Eufratesia	Eufратensis
17	Cilicia	Cilicia	Cilicia
18			Cilicia secunda
19	Isauria	Isauria	Isauria
20	Cyprus	Cyprus	Cyprus
21	Mesopotamia	Mesopotamia	Mesopotamia
22	Osroena	Hosdroene	Osrhoena
23		Sophanene	

public services in Egypt. Thus, the separation of the Egyptian provinces from the dioecesis Orientis evidently was effected after 369/70.

(3) Thebais is attested first in a Latin inscription at the Temple of Luxor (published by P. Lacau, *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 34 [1934], 29-33), 'Aurel(ius) Reginus v. p. praes(es) provinc(iae) Thebaid(os)', which J. Lallemand dates to 300-302 (*Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres de l'Académie Royale de Belgique* 36 [1950], 388, n. 1). Festus does not mention Thebais.

(4, 5) The *praeses* of Aegyptus Herculia first appears in a papyrus petition (P. Merton. 91, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Wilfred Merton*, [Dublin, 1959], 155 ff.) dated 27 December 315; Aegyptus Iovia, however, is found only in Veron. J. Lallemand (*op. cit.*, 388 ff.) has demonstrated that these provinces probably were created around

312/13 and had been joined to form the province of Aegyptus by 325 (see the bishop's lists of the Council of Nicaea, H. Gelzer, *Patrum Nicaenorum Nomina*, p. lx). From this we may infer that this section of Veron. was compiled between 312 and 325. Aegyptus was redivided before 8 April 342, for on that date a rescript was despatched 'ad Auxentium praesid(em) Aug(us)-tamnicae' (*CTh* 12. 1. 34; cp. P. Oxy. 87, Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, I [1898], 150-1). The omission of Augustamnica from Not. Dign. is probably a scribal error: the province was still in existence on 12 January 393 (*CTh* 1. 7. 2). Festus (ch. XIII) mentions only the province of Aegyptus created by Augustus.

(6) Arcadia was created after 386 (*CTh* 1. 14. 1).

(7-9) Mommsen's text of Veron. reads Arabia, item Arabia Augusta Libanensis. Bury (*JRS* 13, 130-2), on the other hand, pointed out that Arabia Augusta Libanensis is an 'impossible' name for a province and suggested an alternative punctuation: Arabia, item Arabia, Augusta Libanensis. A choice between these readings is difficult, for neither Arabia <secunda> nor Augusta Libanensis is found elsewhere. As Bury remarked (p. 131), item 'makes no difference to the sense [and] is doubtless the addition of a copyist to make it clear that Arabia is repeated'. Trajan's Arabia, according to Bury, was divided by Diocletian into a northern province (Arabia I) and a southern province (Arabia II). Before A.D. 325 Arabia II had become part of Palaestina, for the Bishop of Aila - a city formerly in Arabia - is found under the province of Palaestina in the Nicene bishop's list. This arrangement still obtained in 357 when Clematius was appointed governor of Palaestina, which included the city of Petra, formerly within the confines of Arabia II (Libanius *Epp.* 563, 321, and 315). In 358 Palaestina was divided and all the territory of the former province of Arabia II became part of Palaestina salutaris. Thus, Arabia II in Veron., corresponds to Palaestina salutaris in Not. Dign. Augusta Libanensis appears as Foenice Libani in Not. Dign.

Bury's analysis is thorough and convincing, but it is nonetheless strange that the more precise designations, Arabia prima and Arabia secunda, were not employed in Veron. Perhaps this omission is merely a scribal oversight.

Festus (ch. XIV) reports only the creation of the province of Arabia by Trajan.

(10-12) A divided Palaestina – Palaestina, Palaestina salutaris – is attested first by Libanius (*Epp.* 334-5) in 358. Three Palestinian provinces had been created by 23 March 409 (*CTh* 7. 4. 30 = *Cod. Iust.* 12. 37. 13) – ‘per primam, secundam ac tertiam Palaestinam’. Festus (ch. XIII) refers only to Palaestina under Trajan.

(14, 15) Syria Coele alone is found in the lists from the Council of Constantinople in 381 (Mansi, *Conc.* III, 568; cp. ‘consularis Syriae’, *CTh* 8. 4. 11, dated 2 October 365). From this evidence we may infer that Syria salutaris (Not. Dign.) was created after 381.

(16) Augusta Euphratensis is found first in the *Acta ss. Sergii et Bacchi* (*Analecta Bollandiana*, 14 [1895], 377) of 303-5. Euphratensis alone is also found (*CTh* 15. 11. 2, dated 27 September 417; *Cod. Iust.* 8. 10. 10). This province evidently existed in 369/70 and may be detected in Festus’ frequent references to Syriae (chs. III, XIV, XVI).

(17, 18) Since Cilicia alone appears in the lists from the Council of Constantinople (Mansi, III, 568; cp. *CTh* 12. 6. 5, dated 4 July 365), we may conclude that Cilicia secunda was not created before 381. Festus mentions Cilicia in ch. III.

(23) Sophanene was not a Roman province until the reign of Justinian (see Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* v, 574).

Dioecesis Pontica

	Veron.	Pol. Silv.	Not. Dign.
24	Bithinia	Bithinia	Bithynia
25	Cappadocia	Cappadocia	Cappadocia
26			Cappadocia secunda
27	Galatia	(Galatia)	Galatia
28			Galatia salutaris
29	Paphlagonia nunc in duas divisa	Paflagonia	Paphlagonia
30		Honoriada	Honorias
31	Diospontus	Pontus Amasia	Hellespontus
32	Pontus Polemoniacus	Pontus Polemoniacus	Pontus Polemoniacus
33	Armenia minor	Armenia minor	Armenia prima
34			Armenia secunda
35	Nunc et (Armenia) maior addita	Armenia maior	

(25, 26) Cappadocia evidently was divided between 6 July 379 (*CTh* 6. 30. 2 'per Cappadociam') and 27 March 386 (*CTh* 13. 11. 2 'Cappadocia secunda'). But see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, III (1964), Appendix III for an alternative *terminus post quem* (371).

(27) Galatia is listed under the dioecesis Asiana in Pol. Silv. (see Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* v, 575).

(28) Since Galatia alone is found in the lists from the Council of Constantinople (Mansi, *op. cit.*), we may date the creation of Galatia salutaris after 381. Festus (ch. XI) records only the creation of the province Galatia by Augustus.

(29, 30) 'nunc in duas divisa' is considered an interpolation by all commentators – referring to Honorias, which was created between 384 and 387 (see Jones, *Later Roman Empire*, III, 348). Festus (ch. XI) knows Paphlagonia only.

(31) Pontus was undivided under Diocletian ('Aurelius Priscianus v. p. Praes. Prov. Ponti': *CIL* III, 307, 13643, 14184²⁰⁻²¹, 14184³⁹). Diospontus, however, had been created by 325 (bishop's lists from Council of Nicaea attest Diospontus and Pontus Polemoniacus; cp. *CIL* III 14184³¹ 'praes. prov. inc. Diospont.'). Helenopontus – named after Constantine's mother, who died in 329 – replaced Diospontus before 337 (*CIL* III 14184¹⁷, 14184³⁷). The province was recorded under the name of Pontus Amasia (cf. Pol. Silv.) at the Council of Constantinople (Mansi, *op. cit.*), but is entitled Helenopontus in a rescript of 27 March 386 (*CTh* 13. 11. 2). Festus refers only to Pontus (chs. III, XI).

(33, 34) Armenia was divided into prima and secunda before 27 March 386 ('Armenia secunda', *CTh* 13. 11. 2 = *Cod. Iust.* 11. 48. 10; cp. *Cod. Iust.* 8. 10. 10 [issued in 420] 'per utramque Armeniae'). Omission from Pol. Silv. is probably a scribal error. Festus knows only the province of Armenia minor (chs. III, XVI).

(35) 'nunc et maior addita' is considered an interpolation by all commentators. By the treaty of 387 between the Persians and Rome, Armenia maior was added to the Roman sphere of influence: the territory later was administered under the comes Armeniae (Procopius *De Aed.* 3. 1. 14-15; see Bury, *JRS* 13, p. 147).

Dioecesis Asiana

	Veron.	Pol. Silv.	Not. Dign.
36	Pamfilia	Pamphilia	Pamfylia
37	Frigia prima	Phrygia prima	Frygia Pacatiana
38	Frigia secunda	Phrygia secunda	Frygia salutaris
39	Asia	Asia	[Asia]
40	Lidia	Lidia	Lydia
41	Caria	Caria	Caria
42	Insulae	Cicladæ	Insulae
43	Pisidia	Pisidia	Pisidia
44	Hellespontus	Hellespontus	Hellespontus
45		Licia	Lycia
46		Licaonia	Lycaonia

(37, 38) Phrygia is undivided in the lists from the council of Nicaea (Gelzer, *op. cit.*); the lists from the Council of Sardica in 343-4 (Hilary of Poitiers, *De Synodis* 33), however, attest Phrygia prima and secunda. We may conclude, therefore, either (1) that Phrygia was divided in the early fourth century, but had been united into a single province by 325, or (2) that Veron. reflects the division after 325 attested by the lists from the Council of Sardica. By 3 May 361 Phrygia secunda had been renamed Phrygia Salutaris (*CTh* 1. 6. 1 = *Cod. Iust.* 7. 62. 23; cp. *CTh* 1. 6. 10, dated 12 August 385). In the lists from the Council of Constantinople in 381 (Mansi, *op. cit.*), Phrygia Salutaris and Phrygia Pacatiana (cp. Not. Dign.) appear. Festus was cognizant of the division – Phrygiae (ch. X).

(39) Omission of Asia from Not. Dign. must be a scribal error.

(45) Jones (*JRS* 44, p. 26) has suggested that the omission of Lycia from Veron. may not be a scribal error (as Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* v, 577, proposed), since a rescript of 1 June 311 (*CTh* 13. 10. 2; cf. Seeck, *Regesten*, 52-3) indicates that Pamphylia and Lycia were administered jointly – ‘ad Eusebium v. p. praesidem Lyciae et Pamfyliae’. They appear as separate provinces in the Nicene list (Gelzer, *op. cit.*). Lycia is mentioned by Festus (ch. XI) in his account of Servilius’ activities.

(46) Lycaonia is attested shortly before 373 in Basil’s letter to Eusebius, Bishop of Samosata (*Ep.* 138. 8), in which he refers to Ἰκόνιον as the capital of the new province, which had been separated from Pisidia.

Dioecesis Thraciae

	Veron.	Festus (ch. IX)	Pol. Silv.	Not. Dign.
47	Europa	Europa	Europa	Europa
48	Rodope	Rhodopa	Rhodopa	Rhodopa
49	Tracia	Thracia	Thracia prima	Thracia
50	Emosmons	Haemimontus	Haemimontus	Haemimontus
51	Scitia	Scythia	Scithia	Scythia
52	Misia	Moesia	Misia	Moesia
	inferior	inferior	inferior	secunda

(50, 51) The text of Pol. Silv. at this point reads Thracia secunda and Scithia inferior, provinces which are otherwise unknown. The corruption probably resulted from a scribal error, since the proper provinces – Haemimontus and Scythia – are listed under the Dioecesis Moesiarum.

Dioecesis Moesiarum

	Veron.	Festus (ch. VIII)	Pol. Silv.	Not. Dign.
53	Dacia	Dacia I	Dacia	Dacia ripensis
54		Dacia II		Dacia
				Mediterranea
55	Moesia superior	Moesia superior	Moesia	Moesia prima
	Margensis			
56	Dardania	Dardania	Dardania	Dardania
57	Macedonia	Macedonia	Macedonia	Macedonia
58				Macedonia
				salutaris
59	Tessalia	Thessalia	Thessalia	Thessalia
60	[Achaia]	Achaia	Achaia	Achaia
61	Privalentina	Praevalis	Prevalis	Praevalitana
62	Priantina			
63	Epiros nova	Epirus I	Epirus nova	Epirus nova
64	Epiros vetus	Epirus II	Epirus vetus	Epirus vetus
65	Creta	Creta	Creta	Creta

The dioecesis Moesiarum is found only in an inscription (*ILS* 1214) from the reign of Constantine. From Festus we know that this diocese had been divided by 369/70: Dacia I and II, Moesia superior, and Dardania had been joined to the dioecesis Illyricum, the remaining provinces formed the

diocesis Macedonica. Festus' testimony is confirmed by a rescript of 19 March 373 (*CTh* 10. 19. 7; cf. Seeck, *Regesten*, 32) – 'per Illyricum et diocesim Macedonicam'. This division, as Jones (*op. cit.*, p. 21) pointed out, may have been effected by 7 February 327, on which date a rescript was addressed to the comes Macedoniae – all other comites provinciarum ruled over dioceses. Evidence of a reorganization after 370 is provided by Not. Dign. – Dacia ripensis and mediterranea, Moesia prima, Dardania, and Praevalitana comprised the diocesis Daciarum, the remainder were joined to the diocesis Macedonia.

(53, 54) Confirmation of Festus' statement (ch. VIII) 'per Aurelianum . . . duae Daciae in regionibus Moesiae ac Dardaniae facta sunt' (cp. Jord. *Rom.* 233) is provided by an inscription published by B. Filow (*Klio* 12 [1912], 234 ff.): 'Caro et Carino | Augg. Gaianus | preses finem | posuit (i)nter du | [as D]acias dila[psum?]' . Dacia alone is found in a rescript of 6 February 321 (*CTh* 2. 19. 2) 'ad Claudium praesidem Daciae'. A divided Dacia – Dacia, altera Dacia – is attested again in the lists from the Council of Sardica in 343–4 (Mansi, *Conc.* III, 42). Dacia ripensis is found in a rescript of 19 June 364 (*CTh* 15. 1. 13), Dacia mediterranea in a rescript of 29 July 386 (*CTh* 1. 32. 5). Omission of a second Dacia from Pol. Silv. is probably a scribal error.

(55) Mommsen's (*Ges. Schr.* v, 578, 580) text reads Moesia superior Margensis. He considered Margensis an appropriate designation for the province of upper Moesia, since Diocletian defeated Carinus in 285 'apud Margum' (Eutrop. 9. 20). Bury (*op. cit.*, p. 135), however, considered Margensis a separate province, which disappeared before 325 (it is not found in the Nicene list). Both interpretations are possible, but I have preferred Mommsen's and have reproduced his reading in the list.

(58) Bury (*JRS* 10 [1920], 135) suggested that Macedonia salutaris was created under the Grand Chamberlain Eutropius (A.D. 396–9) and was abolished soon after.

(60) All commentators agree that the omission of Achaia from Veron. is a scribal error.

(62) Mommsen (*Ges. Schr.* v, 579, n. 1) suggested that Priantina 'ist Dittographie des folgenden privalentina'.

Dioecesis Pannoniarum

	Veron.	Festus (ch. VIII)	Pol. Silv.	Not. Dign.
66	Pannoniae inferior	Pannonia II	Pannoniae secunda	Pannoniae secunda
67	Savensis	Savia	Savia	Saviae
68	Dalmatia	Dalmatia	Dalmatia	Dalmatiarum
69	Valeria	Valeria	Valeria	[Valeria]
70	Pannoniae superior	Pannonia I	Pannoniae prima	Pannoniae primae
71	Noricus <i>ripensis</i>	Noricum I	Noricus ripensis	Norici ripensis
72	Noricus mediterranea	Noricum II	Noricus mediterranea	Norici mediterranea

(69) Valeria was created by Diocletian and named in honour of Valeria, his daughter (Victor, *Caes.* 40. 10; Amm. Marc. 19. 11. 4). Omission from Not. Dign. is probably a scribal error.

Dioecesis Britanniarum

	Veron.	Festus (ch. VI)	Pol. Silv.	Not. Dign.
73	Primam	Brittania prima	Brittania prima	Brittania prima
74	Secundam	Brittania secunda	Brittania secunda	Brittania secunda
75	Maxime Caesariensis	Maxima Caesariensis	Maxima	Maxima Caesariensis
76	Flaviae Caesariensis	Flavia Caesariensis	Flavia	Flavia Caesariensis
77			Valentiniana	Valentia
78			<i>Orchades</i>	

(77) Valentia does not appear in Veron. or Festus, since it was not created until 369 (Amm. Marc. 28. 3. 7; see above, p. 1).

(78) The Orchades temporarily were added to the Empire by Agricola, but they were never organized as a province. Orchades in Pol. Silv. probably is an interpolation, the basis for which cannot be determined.

Dioecesis Galliarum

	Veron.	Festus (ch. VI)	Pol. Silv.	Not. Gall.	Not. Dign.
79	Belgica prima	Belgica I	Belgica prima	Belgica prima	Belgica prima
80	Belgica secunda	Belgica II	Belgica secunda	Belgica secunda	Belgica secunda

81	Germania prima	Germania I	Germania prima	Germania prima	Germania prima
82	Germania secunda	Germania II	Germania secunda	Germania secunda	Germania secunda
83	Sequania	Maxima Sequanorum	Maxima Sequanorum	Maxima Sequanorum	Maxima Sequanorum
84	Lugdunensis prima	Lugdunensis I	Lugdunensis prima	Lugdunensis prima	Lugdunensis prima
85	Lugdunensis secunda	Lugdunensis II	Lugdunensis secunda	Lugdunensis secunda	Lugdunensis secunda
86			Lugdunensis tertia	Lugdunensis tertia	Lugdunensis tertia
87			Senonia	Lugdunensis senonia	Lugdunensis senonia
88	Alpes Graiae et Poeninae	Alpes Graiae	Alpes Graiae	Alpium Graiarum et Poenninarum	Alpes Poeninae et Graiae

(86, 87) Bury *JRS* 13, 138 and H. Nesselhauf ('Die spätrömische Verwaltung der gallisch-germanischen Länder', *Abhandl. der Preussischen Akad. der Wiss.* [1938], nr. 2, 42) have suggested that Lugdunensis tertia and Lugdunensis senonia were created by the usurper Magnus Maximus; senonia is attested by an inscription (*CIL* XIII 921 = *ILS* 6117, 6117a), which Mommsen (*CIL* XIII, p. 119) dates 'saeculo quarto exeunte'.

Dioecesis Viennensis

	Veron.	Festus (ch. VI)	Pol. Silv.	Not. Gall.	Not. Dign.
89	Biennensis	Viennensis	Viennensis	Viennensis	Viennensis
90	Narbonensis prima	Narbonensis	Narbonensis prima	Narbonensis prima	Narbonensis prima
91	Narbonensis secunda		Narbonensis secunda	Narbonensis secunda	Narbonensis secunda
92	Novem- populi	Novem- populana	Novem- populana	Novem- populana	Novem- populi
93	Aquitania prima	Aquitania I	Aquitania prima	Aquitania prima	Aquitania prima
94	Aquitania secunda	Aquitania II	Aquitania secunda	Aquitania secunda	Aquitania secunda
95	Alpes maritimae	Alpes maritimae	Alpes mariti- marum	Alpium mariti- marum	Alpes maritimae

The title dioecesis Viennensis (Veron.) is not attested elsewhere. It had been renamed dioecesis quinque provinciarum

before 363, for Flavius Sallustius, consul with Julian in 363, had served as *vicarius quinque provinciarum* (*CIL* VI 1729 = *ILS* 1254). L. Duchesne ('Les Documents ecclésiastiques sur les divisions de l'Empire Romain au quatrième siècle,' *Mélanges Graux* [Paris, 1884], 140) suggested that this title probably was created when the diocese contained only five provinces – i.e. before Narbonensis and Aquitania were redivided. By 369/70 the diocese, augmented by Narbonensis secunda and Aquitania secunda, either was known as the diocese of Aquitania (Festus ch. VI – *sunt in Gallia, Aquitania et Brittaniis prouvinciae decem et octo*) or had been absorbed into the dioecesis Galliarum (under which title the provinces appear in Pol. Silv. and Not. Gall.). By 396, the diocese was known as dioecesis septem provinciarum – attested by the lists from the Council of Nîmes in 396, a rescript of 18 June 400 (*CTh* I. 15. 15; H. Nesselhauf, *op. cit.*, 16–17), and Not. Dign.

(90, 91) An undivided Narbonensis is attested by Hilary of Poitiers in 358 (*De Synodis*, proem., Migne *PL* x, 479) and by Ammianus when describing events of 359–61 (18. 1. 4; 22. 1. 2) and again in his list of the provinces of Gaul (15. 11). Ammianus evidently borrowed from a list which depicted the organization of Gaul around the middle of the fourth century or a little later (H. Nesselhauf, *op. cit.*, p. 10, n. 1). The divided province is recorded in lists from the Council of Aquileia in 381 (Mansi, *Conc.* III, 615) in which the bishop 'Narbonensium primae et secundae' appears. Assuming that Veron. provides an accurate and uninterpolated list, we may infer that Narbonensis had been divided early in the fourth century and was united shortly before 358 (see H. Nesselhauf, *op. cit.*, 9–12). Then, between 358 and 381, the province was redivided into prima and secunda. In the absence of contradictory evidence it seems reasonable to suggest that the appearance of an undivided Narbonensis in Festus' list is evidence that the redivision was effected between 370 and 381.

(93, 94) Despite the unanimity of the lists, evidence that Aquitania was undivided around the middle of the fourth century is provided by Hilary of Poitiers in 358 (*De Synodis*, proem.), Amm. Marc. (15. 11), and an Imperial dedication (*CIL* VI 1764 = *ILS* 1255) inscribed between 362 and 364, from which

we learn that Saturninius Secundus had served as praeses provinciae Aquitanicae shortly before 350. If Festus' list is accurate, the province was redivided between 358 and 369/70 (a divided Aquitania is found in the lists from the Council of Aquileia in 381 – Mansi, *op. cit.*).

Dioecesis Italiciiana

	Veron.	Pol. Silv.	Not. Dign.
96	Benetiam Histriam	Venetia cum Histria	Venetiae
97	Flaminiam Picenum	Flaminia	Flaminiae et Piceni annonarii
98		Picenum	Picenum suburbicarii
99	Tusciam Umbriam	Tuscia cum Umbria	Tusciae et Umbriae
100	Apuliam Calabriam	Apulia cum Calabria	Apuliae et Calabriae
101	Lucaniam	Brittia cum Lucania	Lucaniae et Brittiorum
102	Corsica	Corsica	Corsicae
103	Alpes Cotias	Alpes Cottiae <i>et Apenn</i>	Alpium Cottiarum
104	Raetia	Raetia prima	Raetiae primae
105		Raetia secunda	Raetiae secundae
106	[Campania]	Campania	Campania
107		Emilia	Aemiliae
108		Liguria	Liguriae
109		Samnium	Samnii
110	[Sicilia]	Sicilia	Siciliae
111	[Sardinia]	Sardinia	Sardiniae

(97, 98) I have followed the punctuation of Veron. proposed by R. Thomsen (*The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasion* [Copenhagen, 1947], 244–5) – Mommsen's text reads Flaminiam, Picenum. They were still united on 30 September 364 (*CTh* 9. 30. 1), but were divided by 1 December 399 (*CTh* 9. 30. 5).

(101) Lucaniam probably is an abbreviation for Lucania et Bruttii (Thomsen, 205).

(104, 105) Since Veron. provides a patently incomplete list of the Italian provinces, the omission of Raetia secunda may not be significant – i.e. it may have dropped out through scribal error. I cannot discover any reference to Raetia secunda apart from Pol. Silv. and Not. Dign.

(106, 109) Thomsen (*op. cit.*, 213–17) points out that Julius Festus Hymetius was consularis Campaniae cum Samnio (*CIL*

VI 1736 – dated after 368) before 362. Thus, we may infer that Campania and Samnium were administered jointly at mid-century. Samnium, however, was a separate province by 30 September 364 (*CTh* 9. 30. 1). Omission of the joint province from Veron. is probably a scribal error.

(107, 108) Aemilia and Liguria formed a single province on 18 June 385 (*CTh* 2. 4. 4), but were separated by 18 December 396 (*CTh* 4. 22. 4; cf. *CIL* VI 1715). The joint province probably is omitted from Veron. through scribal error. The division of Aemilia and Liguria in Pol. Silv. and Not. Dign. provides a convenient *terminus post quem* for the Italian section in these lists – 18 June 385.

(110, 111) Omission from Veron. is scribal error.

Dioecesis Hispaniarum

	Veron.	Festus (ch. V)	Pol. Silv.	Not. Dign.
112	Beticam	Baetica	Betica	Baetica
113	Lusitaniam	Lusitania	Lusitania	Lusitania
114	Kartaginiensis	Carthaginensis	Carthaginensis	Carthaginensis
115	Gallecia	Gallaecia	Gallaecia	Gallaecia
116	Tharraconensis	Tarraconensis	Tarraconensis	Tarraconensis
117	Mauretania	Mauretania	Tingitana	Tingitana
	Tingitania	Tingitana		
118			insulae	Baearae
			Baearae	
119			transfretum, quod ab oceano infusum (terras intrat) <i>transmittitur</i> inter calpem et Albinum	

(118) Hübner (*RE* II, 2 [1896], 2827) is wrong when he says ‘Seit Diocletian bilden die Inseln eine der sieben Provinzen der Dioecese Hispaniae’ – his evidence is the Not. Dign., which certainly does not date from the reign of Diocletian. Bury (*JRS* 13, p. 142), noting that Festus omits Insulae Baearae, suggested that the province was created after 369/70.

(119) What the scribe of Pol. Silv. intended cannot be determined.

Dioecesis Africae

	Veron.	Festus (ch. IV)	Pol. Silv	Not. Dign.
120	Proconsularis zeugitana	proconsularis	proconsularis, in qua est Cartago	[Africa]
121	Bizacina	Byzacium	Bizacium	Byzacium
122	Numidia cirtensis	Numidia	Numidia	Numidia
123	Numidia militana			
124	Mauretania Caesariensis	Mauretania Caesariensis	Mauretania Caesariensis	Mauretania Caesariensis
125	Mauretania tabia insidiana	Mauretania Sitifensis	Mauretania Sitifensis	Mauretania Sitifensis
126	[Tripolitania]	Tripolis	Tripolis	Tripolis

(120) Zeugitana in Veron. cannot be identified. The omission of Africa pronconsularis in Not. Dign. is probably a scribal error.

(122, 123) The division of Numidia is attested first in 306 (*CIL* VIII 5526 = *ILS* 651); the province had been reunited by 314 (*CIL* VIII 18905). Thus, the *terminus ante quem* for this portion of Veron. is 314.

(124, 125) Mauretania had been divided into Caesariensis and Sitifensis by 290 (*CIL* VIII, 9324, 8924). Tabia insidiana in Veron. is obviously a corruption.

(126) Jones (*op. cit.*, pp. 26-7) has demonstrated that Tripolis (Tripolitania) probably existed before 303 and should be included in Veron. Its omission is probably the result of the corruption Tabia insidiana.

I cannot discover any evidence that the 'complete' lists produced by Festus contain errors and anachronisms. Festus' register certainly does not agree at every point with Veron., Pol. Silv., and Not. Dign., but these divergences are not necessarily incorrect: Veron. seems to describe the provincial structure of the Empire during the early fourth century, while major portions of Pol. Silv. and Not. Dign. reflect an organization after 369/70.

In short, Festus provides accurate lists for the dioceses of Africa, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Illyricum, Macedonia, and Thrace,

which contribute unique information concerning the organization of these Roman territories in 369/70.

Having established the accuracy of the western lists, we may now consider the purpose and organization of the provincial material. Festus introduces his survey of the Roman provinces in ch. IV: *Quo ordine autem singulas prouincias Romana res publica adsecuta sit, infra ostenditur*. Since he intended to treat the provinces in order of acquisition, he provides a rather complete, ordered register of the West, examining each diocese (except Italy, the omission of which I cannot explain) from Africa to Thrace – i.e. moving clockwise from west to east. Within each diocese, however, the provinces are not listed in any apparent order.

A curious anomaly will be observed in ch. IX: the diocese of Thrace, without doubt under the jurisdiction of the Praetorian Prefect of the East during the joint reign of Valens and Valentinian, is included in the examination of the western provinces. Festus evidently considered the East–West boundaries the Hellespont-Propontis-Bosporus in the north and the Libyan-Tripolitanian frontier in the south. That Festus should choose a continental rather than an administrative boundary is surprising – all the more since Valens would find even a ‘paper loss’ of Thrace unwelcome. The irregularity cannot be explained unless we assume that Festus was ignorant of administrative distinctions, which is manifestly improbable. We may conclude only that through carelessness or for some undisclosed reason Festus chose to include Thrace in the western register.

It will be noted in chs. IV – IX that every account of the acquisition of the provinces within a given diocese is terminated by a list of the provinces within that diocese in A.D. 369/70. From this arrangement we may infer that Festus did not intend to comment further on the western provinces; indeed, one will not find additional references to these provinces in the *Breviarium*. Festus, by appending a contemporary (i.e. 369/70) list of the provinces within each diocese, apparently attempted to bring up to date his summary of the western half of the Empire.

In ch. X Festus announces to Valens a new purpose which will require a change in method: *Nunc Eoas partes totumque*

Orientem ac positas sub uicino sole prouincias, qui auctores sceptris tuis parauerint, explicabo, quo studium clementiae tuae, quod in isdem propagandis habes, amplius incitetur. He then proceeds in chs. X–XIII to recount memorable events in the eastern provinces, beginning his discussion with Asia and progressing clockwise around to Cyrene. Then in ch. XIV he supplies a brief history of the eastern limes to the reign of Constantius II.

To understand Festus' purpose in chs. X–XIII we must remember that the *Breviarium* was dedicated to Valens on the eve of his Persian expedition. By citing memorable deeds of exemplary Romans in the East, Festus indirectly exhorted Valens to emulate his noble ancestors in the imminent campaign. Indeed, Festus included the discussion of the eastern provinces quo studium clementiae tuae (i.e. Valens) . . . amplius incitetur. Ch. XIV, in which Festus traces the history of the eastern limes, is the final preface to the Persian history which concludes the *Breviarium*.

Obviously it was quite unnecessary to provide lists of the eastern provinces; Valens, to whom the *Breviarium* was addressed, certainly did not require lists of provinces under his jurisdiction. Moreover, Festus did not wish to conclude his discussion of the eastern provinces with a list. Such a termination was desirable in chs. IV–IX, for he did not intend to treat the western provinces later in the *Breviarium*. Chs. X–XIII, on the other hand, did not conclude his examination of the east, but rather provided an introduction to his subsequent, more lengthy account in chs. XV–XXIX. To include provincial lists in these chapters, therefore, was superfluous and could only impede his narrative.

We may conclude, then, that chs. IV–XIV of the *Breviarium*, which at first glance seem an amorphous hodgepodge, are not illogically presented. Having provided in chs. IV–IX a brief account of the western provinces (acquisition, administration, and status in 369/70), Festus then introduced his discussion of the eastern provinces in chs. X–XIII. The method of presentation is similar (excepting the omission of lists for the East), but the purpose is quite different. Chs. X–XIII do not terminate, but rather introduce the discussion of eastern affairs. This

extension is manifest in ch. XIV, which leads logically to the major theme in the succeeding chapter: Scio nunc, inclyte princeps, quo tua pergat intentio. Requiris profecto, quotiens Babyloniae ac Romanorum arma conlata sint et quibus uicibus sagittis pila contenderint. Breuiter euentum enumerabo bellorum (ch. XV).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following bibliography does not include every book or article consulted in preparing this edition and commentary – e. g. multifarious reference works, MS catalogues, and printed transcriptions of MSS have been omitted. Similarly, it seems unnecessary to list here all the collections of inscriptions, coins, etc. which are included in the list of abbreviations. Thus this bibliography, divided for convenience and clarity into four sections, is merely a guide to the books and articles used and cited in the text.

A. FESTUS AND THE BREVIARIUM

- ENSSLIN, W., 'Zum Heermeisteramt des spätrömischen Reiches', *Klio* 23 (1930), 306.
—, 'Des Symmachus Historia romana als Quelle für Jordanes', *SBAW*, Phil-hist. Kl., Heft 3 (1948).
EUSSNER, A., 'Julius Florus und Festus Rufus', *Philologus* 37 (1874), 154.
GARRONI, A., 'L'iscrizione di Rufio Festo Avieno e l'autore del Breviarium historiae Romanae', *BCAR* 43 (1915), 123.
JACOBI, R., *De Festi Breviarii fontibus* (Bonn, 1874).
MONCEAUX, P., 'Note sur un proconsul d'Afrique: le poète Avienus', *RA* 9 (1887), 191.
NORMAN, A. F., 'Notes on some consulares of Syria'. *ByzZ* 51 (1958), 73.
SCHULTEN, A., 'Zwei Erlasse des Kaisers Valens über die Provinz Asia', *JÖAL* 9 (1906), 40.
SEECK, O., 'Rufius Festus', *RE* VI (1909), 2257.
WÖLFFLIN, E., 'Das Breviarium des Festus', *ALL* 13 (1904), 69, 173.

B. HISTORIANS AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PROBLEMS

- AY, G., *De Livii epitoma deperdita* (Leipzig, 1894).
ENMANN, A., 'Eine verlorene Geschichte der römischen Kaiser und das Buch *De viris illustribus urbis Romae*', *Philologus* Supp. IV, Heft 3 (1884), 335.
ENSSLIN, W., 'Zu Orosius vii, 25, 9 und zum Perserfeldzug des Cäsars Maximianus Galerius', *Phil. Wochenschr.* 60 (1940), 669.
GALDI, M., *L'epitoma nella letteratura Latina* (Naples, 1922).

- GARDTHAUSEN, V., *Die geographischen Quellen Ammians* (Leipzig, 1873).
- GONÇALVES, R., 'A expressão tranquillitas vestra de un passo de Eutropio', *Humanitas* 2 (1948/9), 131.
- HARTKE, W., *De saeculi quarti exeuntis historiarum scriptoribus quaestiones* (Leipzig, 1932).
- HELM, R., 'Hieronymus und Eutrop', *RhM* 76 (1927), 138, 254.
- HOHL, E., 'Zur Historia-Augusta-Forschung', *Klio* 27 (1934), 149.
- KLEBS, E., 'Die Sammlung der Scriptores Historiae Augustae', *RhM* 45 (1890), 436.
- KORNEMANN, E., 'Die neuen Livius-Epitome aus Oxyrhynchus', *Klio Beiheft* II (Leipzig, 1904).
- MALGOVATI, E., 'I Breviari del IV secolo', *AFLC* 21 (1942), 3.
- MOMIGLIANO, A., 'Some Observations on the "Origo Gentis Romanae"', *JRS* 48 (1958), 56 – *Secundo Contributo* (Rome 1960), 145.
- MOMMSEN, T., *Chronica Minora* I (Berlin, 1892).
- , 'Breviarium Eutropius "ab urbe condita"', *Hermes* 1 (1866), 468.
- OPELT, T., 'Epitome', *RLAC* Lief. 38 (1961), 944.
- PIROGOFF, W., *De Eutropii Breviarii indole ac fontibus* (Diss. Berlin, 1873).
- REINHOLD, G., *Das Geschichtswerk des Livius als Quelle späterer Historiker* (Berlin, 1898).
- REUSCH, W., *Der historische Wert der Caracallavita in den Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, *Klio Beiheft* 24, Heft 11 (1931).
- SANDERS, H. A., 'The lost Epitome of Livy', *UMichStud* 1 (1904), 255.
- , 'The Oxyrhynchus Epitome of Livy and Reinhold's Lost Chronicon', *TAPhA* 36 (1905), 5.
- SORN, J., *Der Sprachgebrauch des Eutropius* (Laibach, 1889).
- WAGENER, C., 'Eutropius', *Philologus* 42 (1884), 521.
- , 'Eutropius', *Philologus* 45 (1886), 509.
- WALBANK, F. W., *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* I (Oxford, 1957).
- WERNSDORF, J. C., *Poetae Latini minores* V (Paris, 1825).

C. ROMAN HISTORY

- BADIAN, E., 'The Treaty between Rome and the Achaean League', *JRS* 42 (1952), 76.
- , 'Sulla's Cilician Command', *Athenaeum* N.S. 37 (1959), 279.
- BALSDON, J. P. V. D., 'Rome and Macedon, 205–200 B.C.', *JRS* 44 (1954), 32.

- BAYNES, N. H., 'The Death of Julian the Apostate in a Christian Legend', *JRS* 27 (1937), 22.
- BENNETT, W. H., 'The Death of Sertorius and the Coin', *Historia* 10 (1961), 459.
- BICKERMANN, E., 'Les préliminaires de la seconde guerre de Macédoine', *RevPhil* sér. 3, 9 (1935), 59, 161.
- BIDEZ, J., *La vie de l'Empereur Julien* (Paris, 1930).
- BURY, J. B., 'The Date of the Battle of Singara', *ByzZ* 5 (1896), 302.
- DEBEVOISE, C., *A Political History of Parthia* (Chicago, 1938).
- DILLEMANN, L., 'Ammien Marcellin et les pays de l'Euphrate et du Tigre', *Syria* 38 (1961), 87.
- DOBIAŠ, J., 'Les premiers rapports des Romains avec les Parthes et l'occupation de la Syrie', *AO* 3 (1931), 215.
- DOWNEY, G., 'The Occupation of Syria by the Romans', *TAPhA* 82 (1951), 149.
- , 'Aurelian's Victory over Zenobia at Immae, A.D. 272', *TAPhA* 81 (1950), 57.
- GARZETTI, A., 'M. Licinio Crasso', *Athenaeum* N.S. 22-23 (1944/5), I.
- GÖBL, R., 'Rex . . . datus. Ein Kapitel von der Interpretation numismatischer Zeugnisse und ihren Grundlagen', *RhM* N. F. 104 (1961), 70.
- GUNDEL, H., 'P. Ventidius Bassus', *RE* 2, Reihe xv (1955), 795.
- GUTSCHMID, A. von, *Geschichte Irans* (Tübingen, 1888).
- HAMMOND, M., 'Septimius Severus, Roman Bureaucrat', *HSCPh* 51 (1940), 137.
- , 'Imperial Elements in the Formula of the Roman Emperors during the First Two and a Half Centuries of the Empire', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 25 (1957), 19.
- HANSEN, E. V., *The Attalids of Pergamum* (Ithaca, 1947).
- HOHL, E., 'Das Ende Caracallas', *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia* 2 (1950), 276.
- HOLLEAUX, M., 'Etudes d'histoire hellénistique xi. Le prétendu recours des Athéniens aux Romains en 201/200', *REA* 22 (1920), 77.
- HOLMES, T. R., *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* (London, 2nd ed. 1931).
- HOMO, L., *Essai sur le règne de l'Empereur Aurélien* (Paris, 1904).
- HÜBNER, E., 'Baliares', *RE* II (1896), 2823.
- JARDÉ, A., *Etudes critiques sur la vie et le règne de Sévère Alexandre* (Paris, 1925).
- JONES, H. S., 'A Roman Law Concerning Piracy', *JRS* 16 (1926), 155.

- KOESTERMANN, E., 'Der pannonisch-dalmatinische Krieg 6-9 n. Chr.', *Hermes* 81 (1953), 345.
- LAMBRECHTS, P., 'L'empereur Lucius Verus. Essai de réhabilitation' *AC* 3 (1934), 173.
- LARSEN, J. A. O., 'The Peace of Phoenice and the Outbreak of the Second Macedonian War', *CPh* 32 (1937), 15.
- , 'Was Greece Free Between 196 and 146 B.C.?', *CPh* 30 (1935), 193.
- LEPPER, F. A., *Trajan's Parthian War* (Oxford, 1948).
- LOPUSZANSKI, G., 'La date de la Capture de Valérien et la Chronologie des Empereurs Gaulois', *Cahiers de l'Institut d'études Polonaises en Belgique* 9 (1951).
- MAGIE, D., *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ* (Princeton, 1950).
- MARICQ, A., 'Classica et Orientalia, v: Res Gestae Divi Saporis'. *Syria* 35 (1958), 295.
- , 'Classica et Orientalia, vi: La province d'Assyrie créée par Trajan. A propos de la guerre Parthique de Trajan', *Syria* 36 (1959), 254.
- MELONI, P., *L'amministrazione della Sardegna da Augusto all'Invasione Vandolica* (Rome, 1958).
- MURPHY, G. J., *The Reign of the Emperor L. Septimius Severus from the Evidence of the Inscriptions* (Philadelphia, 1945).
- NAPP, E., *De rebus imperatore M. Aurelio Antonino in Oriente Gestis* (Diss. Bonn, 1879).
- OOST, S. I., 'The fetial Law and the Outbreak of the Jugurthan War', *AJPh* 75 (1954), 147.
- , 'Cato "Uticensis" and the Annexation of Cyprus', *CPh* 50 (1950), 98.
- , 'Cyrene, 96-74 B.C.', *CPh* 58 (1963), 11.
- , 'The Death of the Emperor Gordian III', *CPh* 53 (1958), 106.
- OOTEGHEM, J. van, *Lucius Licinius Lucullus* (*Mémoires: Acad. Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, 2^{ème} série, 53 [1959]).
- , *Pompée le grand* (*Mémoires- Acad. Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, 2^{ème} série, 49 [1954]).
- ORMEROD, H. A., 'The Campaigns of Servilius Isauricus against the Pirates', *JRS* 12 (1922), 35.
- PAIS, E., *Storia della Sardegna* (Rome, 1923).
- PALLU DE LESSERT, A., *Fastes des provinces africaines sous la domination romaine* II (Paris, 1901).

- PAVAN, M., 'L'ambiente militare nella provincia del Norico', *Athenaeum* N.S. 34 (1956), 58.
- PEETERS, P., 'L'intervention politique de Constance II dans la Grande Arménie en 338', *Bull. de la Classe des lettres de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, 3^{ème} série, XVII (1931).
- , 'La légende de Saint Jacques de Nisibe', *Analecta Bollandiana* 38 (1920), 285.
- PEKÁRY, T., 'Bemerkungen zur Chronologie des Jahrzehnts 250–260 n. Chr.', *Historia* 11 (1962), 123.
- PLATNAUER, M., *Life and Reign of the Emperor Lucius Septimius Severus* (Oxford, 1918).
- PRÉAUX, C., 'Une Source nouvelle sur l'annexion de l'Arabie par Trajan', *Phoibos* 5 (1950/1), 123.
- RAMSAY, W. M., 'Anatolica Quaedam', *JHS* 48 (1928), 46.
- , 'Res Anatolicae', *Klio* 22 (1929), 369.
- REINACH, T., *Mithridate Eupator* (Paris, 1890).
- SALMON, E. T., 'Trajan's Conquest of Dacia', *TAPhA* 67 (1937), 83.
- SANCTIS, G. de, 'Il primo testamento regio a favore dei Romani', *RivFC* N.S. 10 (1932), 59.
- SCHMITTHENNER, W., 'Augustus' spanischer Feldzug und der Kampf um das Prinzipat', *Historia* 11 (1962), 29.
- SCHULTEN, A., *Numantia* I (Munich, 1914).
- , *Los Cantabros y Astures y su Guerra con Roma* (Madrid, 1943).
- SEAVER, J. E., 'Publius Ventidius, Neglected Roman Military Hero', *ClassJourn* 47 (1952), 275.
- SEECK, O., *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste* (Stuttgart, 1919).
- SESTON, W., 'L'humiliation de Galère', *REA* 42 (1940), 515.
- STARR, C., *Roman Imperial Navy* (New York, 2nd ed. 1960).
- SYME, R., 'The Spanish War of Augustus (26–25 B.C.)', *AJPh* 55 (1934), 293.
- , Review of J. Klose, *Roms Klientel-Randstaaten am Rhein und an der Donau*, *JRS* 25 (1935), 95.
- THRIGE, P., *Res Cyrenensium* (1828, repr. 1940).
- TOWNSEND, P. W., 'The Administration of Gordian III', *YCS* 4 (1934), 59.
- WALBANK, F. W./A. H. MCDONALD, 'The Origins of the Second Macedonian War', *JRS* 27 (1937), 180.
- WARMINGTON, E. H., *Commerce between the Roman Empire and India* (Cambridge, 1928).
- WELLESLEY, K., 'The Extent of the Territory Added to Bithynia by Pompey', *RhM* N. F. 96 (1953), 293.

- WOLSKI, J., 'The Decay of the Iranian Empire of the Seleucids and the Chronology of the Parthian Beginnings', *Berytus* 12 (1956/7), 35.

D. THE PROVINCIAL LISTS

- BURY, J. B., 'The Provincial List of Verona', *JRS* 13 (1923), 127.
 —, 'The Notitia Dignitatum', *JRS* 10 (1920), 131.
 DUCHESNE, L., 'Les Documents ecclésiastiques sur les divisions de l'Empire Romain au quatrième siècle', *Mélanges Graux* (Paris, 1884), 133.
 FILOW, B., 'Die Teilung des Aurelianischen Dakiens', *Klio* 12 (1912), 234.
 JONES, A. H. M., 'The Date and Value of the Verona List', *JRS* 44 (1954), 21.
 —, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602* (Oxford, 1964).
 KEYES, C. W., 'The Date of the Laterculus Veronensis', *CPh* 11 (1916), 196.
 LACAU, P., 'Inscriptions latines du temple de Luxor', *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 34 (1934), 17.
 LALLEMAND, J., 'La création des provinces d'Égypte Jovia et d'Égypte Herculia', *Bull. de la Classe des lettres de l'Académie Royale de Belgique* 36 (1950), 387.
 MOMMSEN, T., 'Verzeichniss der römischen Provinzen aufgesetzt um 297', *Abhandl. der Berliner Akademie der Wiss., phil-hist. Kl.* (1862), 489 – *Gesammelte Schriften* v (1908), 561.
 NESSELHAUF, H., 'Die spätrömische Verwaltung der gallisch-germanischen Länder', *Abhandl. der Preussischen Akad. der Wiss.* (1938).
 SCHWARTZ, E., 'Über die Bischofslisten der Synoden von Chalkedon, Nicaea und Konstantinopel', *Abhandl. der Bayerischen Akad. der Wiss. N. F.* 13 (1937), 79.
 THOMSEN, R., *The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasions* (Copenhagen, 1947).

INDEX VERBORUM

I have not attempted a complete philological analysis of the *Breviarium*: E. Wölfflin (*ALL* [1904], 174 ff.) provides a full philological introduction, and much can be learned from J. Sorn's study *Der Sprachgebrauch des Eutropius* (1889). What follows is merely a list of unusual (primarily late Latin) words and phrases which appear in the text.

- admodum (= fere), 63.18
- agmina = copiae, 65.21, 66.9, 68.5, 68.12, 68.21
- aliquanta (= aliquot) pars Phoenices, 59.8
- Breuem, 45.1
- calculonum, 45.3
- caput gentis, 53.3
- clementia tua, 45.1, 53.15 (cf. inclyte princeps 58.3, perennitatis uestrae 45.8, princeps inuicte 69.7)
- clibanariis, 58.12, clibanariorum, 65.3
- collecta de agris multitudine, 49.14/15, collecta Syrorum agrestium, 64.15
- conflictu, 57.15
- congressionem, 65.13, leues congregationes, 66.15
- cum maxima uenerationis reuerentia, 64.7
- cum uictoria remeantes, 49.13/14 (cf. rediens uictor, 64.3)
- desperatione rerum suarum, 59.3
- dispendiosis, 69.3
- diualis (Constantii), 58.1
- Eoas partes, 53.13
- expertae felicitatis, 58.19, 67.14
- foedarunt, 62.10
- Illyricus, 52.6
- in solo barbariae, 52.2
- intimabo, 46.10
- limitaneis, 65.17 (cf. excubantium in limite, 66.15)
- mortui (eius), 60.10
- nullo eam obsistente, 65.9 (cf. nullo prohibente, 68.4)
- obtinuimus, 48.14
- occubisset, 55.9
- post Alexandrum, 62.17 (cf. post Augustum, 62.10)
- praesidales, 48.11, 49.6
- praesumpserant, 50.20
- prolixior = longior, 68.19
- propria morte, 63.16 (cf. propria uoluntate 48.6/7, sponte sua 57.8, sponte propria 63.1)
- reuocauit = reduxit, 61.8
- sub uicino sole, 53.13/14
- suscipere = accipere, 65.15, 67.19, 68.18
- totius orbis regnator, 67.16 (cf. uictor totius gentis 65.10/11, rerum dominus 66.6)
- tunc temporis, 61.14

GENERAL INDEX

- Achaean League, Roman war with, 113-14
 Adherbal, son of Micipsa, 48, 103
 L. Aemilius Paullus, 51, 114, 115
 L. Afranius (legate 53 B.C.), 107, 108, 132
 M. Agrippa, campaign in Spain, 108
 Amida, battle of, 66, 149, 151
 Ammianus Marcellinus, place in fourth-century historiography, 10
 Amyntas, Deiotarus' secretary, 122
 Ancus Marcius, 45
 L. Anicius Gallus, praetor (168 B.C.), 37-8, 51, 115
 Annia Lucilla, 140
 Antiochus III, 46, 53, 54, 55, 74, 119, 121, 124; elephants of, 55; alliance with Philip V, 112
 Antiochus IV, 125
 Antiochus XIII Asiaticus, 125
 M. Antonius, 56, 75, 87, 122; Parthian campaign of, 61, 134-5
 M. Antonius 'Creticus', 111
 Apafraze (for Ariarathes IV Eusebes), 39, 55, 122
 Apamea, Peace of, 119, 124, 125
 Appion (Ptolemy), King of Cyrene, 56, 81, 127
 Archelaus, Cappadocian ruler, 55, 123
 Aretas III, King of Nabataean Arabs, 131
 Ariarathes V Eusebes, 123
 Ariobarzanes, ruler of Cappadocia, 55, 122, 123
 Ariobarzanes, son of Artabazus, King of Medes, 135
 Aristarchus, 59, 83, 130
 Armenia, 137-8; annexation of, 140; declared province, 138; surrendered by Hadrian, 140
 Arsaces, King of Parthians, 58; dynastic name of Parthian kings, 136; son of Diran, 150, 151
 Artabanus V, King of Media, 142
 Artaces, 59, 131
 Artavasdes II, 135
 Assyria, annexation of, 140; surrendered by Hadrian, 140
 Lucius Ateius Praetextatus Philologus, author of a *breviarium*, 12
 Athanarich, Gothic chieftain, 3
 Athenians, appeal of, 50, 111ff.
 Attalus III of Pergamum, testament of, 53, 73-4, 119, 120
 Augustus Caesar, 46, 48, 51, 54, 55, 56, 61, 62, 74, 75, 87, 135, 136, 137; Spanish campaign, 108
 Aurelian, 52; Persian campaign of, 65, 92, 145-6; triumph of, 146
 M. Aurelius Antoninus, 57, 63, 140-41; Marcomannic War, 116
 M. Aurelius Severus Alexander, Persian campaign of, 57, 63, 90, 142-3; triumph of, 64, 90, 95, 143; received cognomina *Azabenicus*, *Parthicus*, *Arabicus*, 63
 Aurelius Victor, *Caesares*, possible source of *Breviarium*, 88ff., 97
 Axidares, King of Armenia, 138
 T. Baebius Atticus, procurator in Illyria, 115
 Bato, King of Breucians, 51, 115, 116
 Bato, King of Dalmatae, 115, 116
 Bocchus I, King of Mauretania, 48, 104

- Bocchus II, 104, 105
 Bogud, 104, 105
 Breviaria, characteristics of, 11-13;
 popularity of, 19-20, 31-2
Breviarium, date of composition,
 1-3; dedication of, 3-4, 14-15;
 title, 13-14; purpose of com-
 position, 14-16
 sources, 70ff.; stylistic change,
 97; comparison with Eutropius,
 15, 17-18, 72; MSS of, 21-32;
 editions of, 32-5; translations of,
 35; popularity of, 19-20, 25-6
 examples of extreme compression,
 18; examples of rhetoric, 18, 73-5
 list of kings, 45; chronological
 schema, 45-6, 71, 99-100; pro-
 vincial lists, 47-58; Persian wars
 with Rome, 58-69; Julian's Per-
 sian campaign, 16, 67-8, 98;
 unique information in, 76-86,
 89ff.; errors, 36-41, 100, 105
- M. Caecilius Metellus (cos. 115 B.C.),
 47, 102-3
 Q. Caecilius Metellus (cos. 109 B.C.),
 48, 104
 Q. Caecilius Metellus (cos. 69 B.C.),
 50, 111
 Q. Caecilius Metellus (cos. 80 B.C.),
 107
 Q. Caecilius Metellus (praetor
 148 B.C.), 51, 114-15
 L. Caesenius Paetus, governor of
 Cappadocia, 137
 Calvisius Sabinus, governor of Pan-
 nonia, 116
 Caracalla, death of, 63, 89, 142;
 Parthian campaign of, 63, 142
 Carrhae, battle of, 132-3
 Carus, Persian campaign of, 65,
 93, 94, 95, 146; death of, 146
 C. (Lucius: Festus) Cassius Longi-
 nus, quaestor 51 B.C., 39, 60, 84,
 133-4
 Cassivellaunus, King of Trino-
 vantes, 110
 13—B.F.
- Cephisodorus, Athenian ambassa-
 dor to Rome, 112-13
 Chronicon (Reinhold's), source of
Breviarium, 70, 71, 73, 82, 84, 85,
 88
 chronicon, characteristics of, 11-12
 Appius Claudius Pulcher (procos.
 18 B.C.), campaign against Scordi-
 sci, 52, 118
 M. Claudius Marcellus, 18, 47,
 101, 102
 Cleopatra, 56
 clibanarii, 58, 65, 82, 92
 Constans II, ordinance of, 10
 Constantine, planned Persian cam-
 paign of, 66, 149; death of, 149;
 Gothic victory of, 66, 149
 Constantius, 58, 66, 96; Persian
 campaign of, 40, 66-7, 149-51
 Constantius and Julian, encourage-
 ment of liberal studies, 10
 Cn. Corbulo, Parthian campaign
 of, 137-8.
 C. Cornelius Gallus, governor of
 Egypt, 56, 127
 L. Cornelius Scipio, 56, 124
 P. Cornelius Scipio (cos. 218 B.C.), 48
 Cn. Cornelius Scipio (Calvus), 106
 P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, 48,
 106-7
 P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus, 47,
 106
 Cyrene, bequeathed to Rome, 126;
 annexed, 126
- Decebalus, Dacian leader, 52, 116
 L. Decidius Saxa, 134
 Deiotarus, tetrarch of Tolostobogii,
 54, 122
 Deiotarus Philadelphos, 124
 M. Didius, praetor 101/100 B.C.,
 52, 117
 Diocletian, Persian campaign of,
 57, 65, 147-8
 Diran, King of Armenia, 149
 Donnes, 61, 135-6

- Eliensi, battle of, 67, 149, 150
 epitome, characteristics and success of, 11-12
 Epitome Liviana, 11, 70ff., 77, 81, 85, 87, 88, 98
 Erucius Clarus, legate (A.D. 116), 139
 Eudemos of Pergamum, 119
 Eumenes of Pergamum, 119
 Eusebius, *Chronicon*, 12
 Eutropius, *Breviarium*, title, 13; purpose of composition, 14-16; dedication, 14-16; historical method of, 17; popularity of, 19-20; compared with Festus' *Breviarium*, 15, 17-18, 72
 Festi in the fourth and fifth centuries, 4
 Festus, the author of the *Breviarium*, name, 4; career, 4-7; proconsul Asiae, 4-5, 9; consularis Syriae, 5, 9; magister memoriae, 6, 9; death of, 5; pagan sympathies of, 9n; historical method, 17, 36
 Rufius Festus Avienus, 7; career of, 7-9; proconsul Africae, 8, 9; proconsul Achaiae, 8, 9; not author of *Breviarium*, 8-9
 Julius Festus (Hymetius), proconsul Africae (A.D. 366/7), 8, 166
 First Punic War, 100; treaty ending, 101
 C. Flaminius, praetor in Sicily, 101
 Flavius Sallustius, 165
 Florus, source of *Breviarium*, 70ff., 86-7, 97, 98
 W. Foerster, editor of *Breviarium*, 21
 M. Furius Camillus (Dictator, 390 B.C.), 49, 109
 Gaius (Claudius: Festus) Caesar, 40; Armenian campaign of, 61, 135-6; death of, 136
 Gallic Wars, 49-50, 109; sack of Rome, 108-9
 Gallienus, Persian campaign of, 64, 145
 Gentius, Illyrian ruler, 51, 115
 Gordian III, Parthian campaigns of, 64, 143; death of, 64, 91, 144
 Hadrian, 57, 62-3, 140
 Hannibalianus, campaign in Armenia of, 149
 Hiempsal, son of Micipsa, 48, 103
 Hiero II, King of Syracuse, 18, 47, 101-2
 Hieronymus, King of Syracuse, 18, 101; death of, 101-2
 Hippolytus, *Chronicon*, 12
 Immae, battle of, 65, 145-6
 Jerome, *Chronicon*, 12
 Jordanes, *Romana*, 35-6, 37, 38
 Jovian, 46; Persian campaign, 2, 18, 68-9, 153
 Juba I, King of Numidia, 36, 48, 105
 Juba II, 104
 Jugurtha, Rome's war with, 48, 103-4
 Julian, Emperor, death of, 68, 152-3; Persian expedition of, 16, 17n, 67-8, 151-3; fleet in Euphrates, 67, 152
 Julius Alexander, legate (A.D. 116), 139
 C. Julius Caesar, 36, 78; received Gaul and Illyria, 107; Gallic war of, 49-50, 110; invasion of Britain, 50, 110
 Sextus Julius Africanus, *Chronographia*, 12
 Sextus Julius Caesar, Roman ambassador, 113
 D. Junius Brutus (Callaicus), cos., 138, 48, 106
 Kaisergeschichte (Enmann's), 17; as source of *Breviarium*, 70, 88ff., 97-8

- Q. Labienus, 60, 134
 Laterculus Polemii Silvii, 154ff.
 Laterculus Veronensis, 154ff.
Liber Generationis, 12, 71
 L. Licinius Lucullus (cos. 74 B.C.),
 56-7, 58, 76, 128-9
 M. Licinius Crassus, Parthian cam-
 paign of, 59-60, 74, 76, 87, 132-3;
 received province of Syria, 107,
 132; lost standards of, 62, 136
 P. Licinius Crassus, 133
 P. Licinius Valerianus, Persian cam-
 paign of, 64, 144; capture of, 64,
 144
 limes Orientalis, 57
 limitanei, 65, 148
 M. Livius Drusus, procos., 111, 52,
 117-18; triumphed, 118
 Livy, *Periochae*, as source of *Brevi-*
 arium, 70ff., 87-8
 M. Lollius, proprætor in Galatia, 55
 122
 C. Lutatius Catulus, 100
 Q. Lutatius Catulus, 109
 Q. Lutatius Cerco, 101

 Macedonian Wars, 52; Second,
 causes of, 111-13
 Magnesia, battle of, 56, 124
 Cn. Manlius Vulso (Mummius:
 Festus), 39, 54, 121
 C. Marius, campaigns against Ju-
 gurtha, 48, 104; Gallic campaigns
 of, 49, 109-10
 Massinissa, King of Numidia, 103
 Maximianus Caesar (= Galerius),
 'humiliation' of, 65, 147-8; Per-
 sian campaign of, 95-6, 148
 Maximus, theurgist executed by
 Festus, 4-5
 Mazzaro, 60, 132
 Micipsa, King of Numidia, 48, 103
 M. Minucius Rufus, 52, 117, 118;
 triumphed, 118
 Mithridates VI, 46, 55, 58, 122,
 123, 124, 128-30; death of, 59,
 130

 L. Mummius, sacked Corinth, 50,
 114

 Narasarensi, battle of, 67, 149, 150
 Narseus (= Narses), 57, 65, 146-7,
 148; death of, 67, 150
 Nero, Armenian campaign of, 62,
 137; invests Tiridates, 138
 Nicomachi, 10
 Nicomedes III, 124
 Nicomedes IV, bequeathed Bithynia
 to Rome, 54, 121, 122
 Nisibis, battles of, 67, 149, 151
 Notitia Dignitatum, 154ff.
 Notitia Galliarum, 154ff.
 Numa Pompilius, 45

 Odenathus, decurio Palmyrenus,
 Persian campaign of, 64, 144-5
 Orhodes, King of Albani, 59, 131
Origo Gentis Romanorum, not a brevi-
 arium, 18-19
Origo Urbis Romae, 71
 Orodes, Parthian king, 134
 Osaces, 134
 Osroes, Parthian king, 138

 Pacorus, 61, 133, 134
 Parthamasiris, 138
 Parthaspates, ruler of Osrhoene,
 140
 M. Perperna Vente, 107
 Perseus, 51, 114, 115
 Pertinax, 57
 M. Petreius, 107, 108
 Pharnaces, son of Mithridates VI,
 130
 Philip V of Macedon, 50, 51, 111,
 112, 113
 Philip the Arab, 64, 91, 143-4
 Phoenice, peace of, 112
 Phraataces, King of Parthians (Ar-
 saces: Festus), 135-6
 Phraates IV, Parthian king, 136
 Phraates, son of Phraates IV of
 Parthia, 136-7

- Placidus, epigram of, 7
 M. Plautius Silvanus, 116
 Pompeiani, 60, 105, 134
 Pompey, 57, 58-9, 61, 76, 110;
 Mithridatic campaigns, 129-30;
 in Spain, 48, 107-8; eastern
 settlement, 55, 59, 122ff., 130-2
 M. Porcius Cato Uticensis, 56, 126
 L. Postumius Albinus, triumph of,
 106
 provincial lists, 47-58; accuracy of,
 72; purpose and organization of,
 108-9, 169-71
 Pseudophilip (Andriscus), 51, 114,
 115
 Ptolemy V, legates from, 111-12
 Ptolemy VIII Euergetes (Antiquior:
 Festus), 56, 81; 'testament' of,
 126
 Ptolemy XI Alexander II, 126;
 'testament' of, 126
 Ptolemy XII Auletes, 126
 Pylamenes, 55, 123, 124
 Pyrrhus, 50

 T. Quinctius Flamininus, 51; de-
 feated Philip V, 113-14

 'Renaissance' of the fourth cen-
 tury, 10
 Rhodaspes, son of Phraates IV of
 Parthia, 136-7
 Romulus, 45

 sagittarii, 58, 60, 65, 82, 92
 Sapor, 64, 143-4
 Sapor II, King of Persia, 149, 150
 151
 Saturninius Secundus, 166
 C. Scribonius Curio, 51, 105, 115
Scriptores Historiae Augustae, possible
 source of *Breviarium*, 88ff.
 Septimius Severus, Parthian cam-
 paign of, 63, 141-2; received
 cognomina, 63, 141, 142

 Seraspadanes, son of Phraates IV
 of Parthia, 136-7
 Q. Sertorius, 48, 107
 P. Servilius Vatia, 54; cognomen
 'Isauricus', 56, 125; against
 pirates, 54, 120-1, 125
 Servius Tullius, 45, 71
 Sicgarena, battle of, 66, 149, 151
 Silaces, 60, 133
 P. Silius Nerva, governor of Illyri-
 cum, 115
 Singara, battle of, 67, 149, 151
 Singarena, battle of, 66, 149, 151
 Sisarvena, battle of, 66, 149, 151
 Sporaces, phylarch of Anthemusia,
 139
 Sulla, 37, 48; participation in war
 with Jugurtha, 104; against
 Mithridates, 123; received legates
 from Parthians, 58, 128
 Surena, 60, 133
 Symmachi, 10
 Symmachus, *Historia Romana*, 35-6

 Lucius Tarquinius Superbus, 45
 Priscus Tarquinius, 45
 M. Terentius Varro Lucullus, 53,
 79-80, 118-19; triumph over
 Bessi, 118
 Theodosius the Elder, 1
 Tiberius (Claudius: Festus), 39,
 55, 74, 123, 135, 136; campaigned
 against Bato, 115
 Tigranes I, 57, 58, 59, 82, 128, 130
 Tigranes II, 135
 Tigranes III, 135
 Tigranes V, 137
 Tiridates, son of Vologases I, 137-8
 Tiridates II, 136
 Trajan, 87; Dacian campaigns of
 52, 116-17; Parthian campaigns
 of, 57, 62, 138; eastern campaign
 of, 139-40
 Tullus Hostilius, 45

 Ulpian, 63-4, 143

- Vaballathus, 145
- Valens, 2, 3, 5, 9; victory over
Goths, 2, 3, 69; Festus' *Breviarium*
dedicated to, 3, 14-16; Eutro-
pius' *Breviarium* dedicated to
14-16; ordinance of, 10.
- Valentinian, 1, 2, 3
- Valentinian, Valens, Gratian, *de*
studiis liberalibus, 10
- M. Valerius Laevinus, 50, 110
- M. Valerius Messalla, 18, 101
- P. Ventidius Bassus, 85; Parthian
campaign of, 60, 134; triumph
of, 134
- Vologases I, 137-8
- Vologases IV, 142
- Vonones, son of Phraates IV of
Parthia, 136-7
- Wagener, C., editor of *Breviarium*, 21
- Xerxes (Artaxerxes = Ardashir I),
63, 143
- Zenobia, 65, 145-6

INDEX OF PEOPLES AND PLACES

- Achaia, 8, 38, 46, 50, 52, 113, 114, 162
 Acharnanians, 111, 112
 Achivi, 51
 Adiabene, 141-2
 Aegyptus, 47, 56, 62, 156-7; annexation of, 127
 Aemilia, 167
 Aethiopes, 137
 Afri, 48
 Ager Aperensis, 120
 Ager Gedusanus, 120
 Ager Orandicus, 120
 Albani, 59, 62, 131, 139
 Alexandrini, 56
 Allia (river), 37, 108
 Alpes, 49; Maritimae, Cottiae, Raetiae, Noricae, Pannoniae, Moesia, 47; Graiae, 50; Juliae, 51
 Amantini, 51, 116
 Ambrones, 109
 Anthemusium, 62, 139
 Antioch, 59, 65, 146
 Apollonia, 53
 Aquitania, 50, 165-6
 Arabes, 47, 57, 59, 62, 63, 77, 139, 141
 Arabia, 47, 57, 63, 141, 157-8; annexation of, 40
 Arcadia, 157
 Armenia, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 137-8, 140, 159; maior, 57, 59, 62, 130, 159; minor, 47, 58, 129
 Armenii, 59, 61, 135
 Artaxata, 59
 Asia, 46, 53, 56, 120, 160
 Assyria, 47, 57, 62, 63, 140
 Astures, 48, 108
 Athenienses, 50, 111-13
 Attaleia, 120
 Augusta Euphratensis, 158
 Augusta Libanensis, 157
 Augusta Vindelicum, 51
 Aziabeni, 63, 141
 Babylonia, 62, 139, 140, 142
 Babylonii, 58, 69 (*see Persae*)
 Bactri, 137
 Baetica, 49, 108
 Bastarnae, 137
 Belgica, 50
 Bessi, 53, 118
 Bithynia, 54, 124
 Bosphorians, 59, 62, 83-4
 Bosphorus, 59
 Breucians, 115, 116
 Britannia, 46, 50; provinces of, 1, 2, 50, 78, 163
 Byzacium, administration of, 48, 105
 Cabyle, 53, 119
 Calathum, 53
 Cales, 73, 106
 Campania, 167
 Cantabri, 48, 108
 Capitolium, 49, 108
 Cappadoces, 55
 Cappadocia, 55, 122-3, 159
 Cardueni, 47, 62, 77, 139
 Caria, 54, 120
 Carrhae, 132-3
 Carthage, 8, 47, 48, 103
 Carthaginensis, 49, 108
 Cilices, 56, 125
 Cilicia, 47, 111, 158
 Cimbri, 109
 Circensium, 64, 144
 Cochen, 65, 146
 Colchi, 59, 62, 84, 129, 130, 139

- Corcyrus, 120
 Corinth, 50, 114
 Corsica, 47, 78, 103
 Creta, 50, 52, 111
 Ctesiphon, 16, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67,
 68, 76, 132, 139, 142, 146, 152
 Cyprus, annexation of, 56, 126
 Cyrene, 56, 81, 126-7
- Daci, 52, 116-17, 118, 137
 Dacia, 52, 65, 117, 162; *ripensis*,
 162; *mediterranea*, 162
 Dalmatae, 46, 115
 Dalmatia, 52
 Danuvium, 46, 47, 51, 52, 53, 115,
 118
 Daphne, 59, 75, 146
 Dardani, 46, 51, 79, 115
 Dardania, 38, 52, 116
 diocesis Aegypti, 155
 Africae, 48, 168
 Asiana, 160
 Brittaniarum, 50, 163
 Daciarum, 162
 Galliarum, 50, 163-4, 165
 Hispaniarum, 49, 167
 Illyricum, 52, 161
 Italiciana, 166
 Macedonica, 52, 162
 Moesiarum, 161-2
 Orientis, 53, 155-8
 Pannoniarum, 163
 quinque provinciarum, 164-5
 septem provinciarum, 165
 Thraciae, 53, 161, 169
 Viennensis, 164
 Diospontus, 159
 Dravum, 51, 116
- Edessa, 63, 89
 Eliensi, 67, 95, 150
 Emesa, 146
 Epirotae, 50, 114
 Epirus, 52
 Eumolpiada (*Philippopolis*), 53, 80,
 118-19
- Euphrates, 60, 62, 67; *limes*, 57,
 63
 Europa, 53, 118
- Flaminia, 166
 Flavia Caesariensis, 50
- Gadis, 37, 48, 106
 Galatae, 54, 121
 Galatia *salutaris*, 159
 Gallaecia, 49, 108
 Gallia, 46, 50; *Narbonensis*, 50,
 109, 165
 Gallograecia (*Galatia*), 54, 121,
 122, 159
 Garamantes, 137
 Germania, 50
 Gordyene, 132, 139
 Goths, 2-3, 66, 69, 149
 Graeci, 50
- Hadriaticum, 50, 110-11
 Haemimontani, 53, 118
 Haemimontus, 53
 Hebrus (river), 52, 118
 Helenopontus, 159
 Hellespontus, 54, 120
 Hiberi, 62, 131, 139
 Hiberia, 59
 Hierosolyma, 59
 Hispani, 48
 Hispania, 46, 48-9, 106-8
 Histri, 46
 Histrum, 53
 Honorias, 159
- Illyri, 51
 Illyricum, 46, 50; *provinces in*, 38,
 52
 Immae, 65, 93, 146
 Indi, 62, 137
 Insulae (*province*), 54, 120
 Insulae *Balears*, 167
 Ionium mare, 50, 110-11
 Isauri, 56, 121, 125
 Itali, 49, 78
 Italia, 46, 49, 50

- Ituraei, 77
 Iudaea, 47, 59, 131
 Iudaei, 57

 Libya, 56, 81, 127
 Libya Pentapolis, 56, 81, 127
 Libyrni, 46
 Liguria, 167
 Lucania et Bruttium, 166
 Lugdunensis, 50, 164
 Lusitani, 48, 106, 107
 Lusitania, 49, 108
 Lycia, 54, 120, 160
 Lydia, 54, 119, 120

 Macedones, 46, 51
 Macedonia, 51, 52
 Madaena (Media), 58, 61, 68, 82, 129
 Magaba, Mt (Modiacus), 54, 121
 Marcomanni, 51, 116
 Marcomedi, 62, 139
 mare Rubrum, 62, 139-40
 Mauretania, 48, 104-5; Caesariensis, 48, 105, 168; Sitifensis, 48, 105, 168
 Mauri, 48
 Maxima Caesariensis, 50
 Maxima Sequanorum, 50
 Medes, 137
 Mediolanum, 48
 Melitena, 58, 129
 Mesopotamia, 47, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 66, 69, 140, 145, 148
 Milyada, 119
 Moesi, 38, 46, 51
 Moesia inferior, 53; superior, 38, 52, 162
 mons Caprus, 39-40, 60
 Mysia, 119

 Nisibis, 2, 57, 58, 67, 69, 82, 129, 135-7, 141, 145, 149, 151-3
 Noricum, 51, 52, 115
 Novempopulana, 50
 Numantia, 48, 107
 Numidia, 47, 48, 104, 168; Roman relations with, 103-5; administration of, 105

 Oceanum, 48, 106
 Olympum, Mt, 54, 120
 Oriens, 47, 61, 65, 66
 Ὀρονδικοί, 121
 Osrhoena, 56, 63, 132
 Osrhoeni, 62, 139
 Ostia, 46, 100

 Palaestina, 57, 157, 158
 Palmyra, 146
 Pamphylia, 54, 120
 Pannonia, 51, 52
 Pannonii, 51
 Paphlagonia, 55, annexation of, 124
 Paphlagonii, 55
 Parthenopolis, 53
 Parthi, 47, 59, 60, 61, 64, 67, 132, 134 (*see Persae*)
 Pergamum, 119, 120
 Persae, 16, 57; wars with Rome, 58ff.; used interchangeably with Babylonii and Parthi in the *Breviarium*, 81
 Persis, 62, 65, 94
 Phaselis, 120
 Phoenice, 57, 59, 130
 Phrygia, 54, 119, 120, 160; salutaris, 160; Pacatiana, 160
 Picenum, 166
 Pisidia, 54, 80, 120
 Pontus, 46, 47, 53, 55, 58, 80, 123, 128, 158-9
 Portus, 46, 100
 Praaspa (Vera), 135
 Praevalis, 52

 Quadi, 51, 116

 Raetia, 166
 Rhenus, 50, 110
 Rhodes, 54
 Rhodii, 54, 112
 Rhodopa, 52, 53, 118

- Sagumbri, 110
 Samnium, 167
 Saraceni, 47, 56, 59, 77, 131
 Sardi, 47, 78, 102-3
 Sardinia, 47, 78, 102-3; adminis-
 tration of, 103
 Sarmatae, 79, 137
 Sarmizegetusa, 117
 Savum, 51, 116
 Scordisci, 52, 117, 118
 Scythae, 53, 131
 Scythia, 53
 Seleucia, 62, 63, 76, 139, 141, 142,
 151
 Seres, 137
 Sicilia, 18, 47, 101-2; administra-
 tion of, 102
 Siculi, 47
 Singara, 66, 67, 149-51
 Sophanene, 158
 Suavia, 52
 Syracuse, 101
 Syri, 64
 Syria, 39, 47, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 64,
 125, 130, 134; Coele, 158; Eu-
 phratensis, 158
 Tarraconensis, 49, 108
 Taurus Mts, 55, 56, 124
 Tectosagi, 121
 Teutones, 109
 Thessali, 51
 Thessalia, 52
 Thrace, 52, 53, 161
 Thraces, 46, 52, 117
 Tigranocerta, 58, 82, 128
 Tigris, 62, 65, 67, 68; limes, 57
 Tingitana Mauretania, 49, 108
 Tolostobogii, 121, 122
 Tomos, 53
 Transtigritani regiones, 57, 66, 148
 Trinovantes, 110
 Tripolis, administration of, 48, 105,
 168
 Trocmi, 121
 Uscudama (Hadrianopolis), 53, 119
 Valentia, 1, 2, 3, 163
 Valeria (province), 51, 52, 116, 163
 Viennensis, 50
 Zeugma, 59, 132

INDEX OF ANCIENT AUTHORS AND PASSAGES

(a) LITERARY

- Ammianus Marcellinus* (ed. C. U. Clark)
 14. 11. 10: 147
 15. 1: 10
 18. 5. 7: 150
 19. 20. 6: 151
 22. 16. 24: 127
 23. 3. 5: 152
 23. 3. 9: 152
 23. 5. 7: 91
 23. 6. 12: 77
 25. 7. 9: 148
 27. 4. 4: 117
 27. 4. 10: 117, 118
 27. 4. 12: 119
 28. 3. 7: 1
 29. 2. 22: 4
Ampelius 44: 114
Anon., De Viris Illustribus:
 23. 8: 109
 23. 9: 79
Anon., Epitome de Caesaribus:
 27. 3: 91
 43. 2: 152
Anon. Valesianus 35: 149
Appian:
Maced. 4. 2: 112
Illyr. 30: 119
Aurelius Victor, Caesares:
 21. 5-6: 89
 24. 2: 90
 38. 3-5: 93
 39. 34: 96
 41. 16: 96
Cassiodorus Chronica
 a.u.c. 658: 81
- Cicero Leg. Agr.:*
 2. 40: 121
 2. 50: 120
- Dio Cassius:*
 40. 16. 3: 132
 49. 43. 7: 104
- Eunapius, vitae Sophistarum* (ed. Giangrande) 7. 6. 6-13: 5
- Eutropius:*
 1. 8: 100
 5. 5. 2: 124
 6. 1. 3: 107
 6. 2. 1: 118
 6. 2. 2: 79
 6. 3: 80
 6. 8. 4: 76
 6. 9. 1: 82, 128
 6. 9. 3: 129
 6. 10: 80, 119
 6. 11. 2: 81
 6. 12. 2: 83
 6. 13: 76, 77
 6. 14. 1: 83, 131
 6. 14. 2: 75
 6. 17. 1-3: 78
 6. 17. 3: 110
 6. 18. 2: 84
 7. 5. 2: 74, 85
 7. 7: 75
 7. 10. 2: 122
 7. 10. 3: 123
 7. 11. 2: 74
 8. 2. 2: 117
 8. 3. 1: 139
 8. 3. 2: 82, 139

8. 6. 2: 140
 8. 10. 2: 141
 8. 23: 90, 143
 9. 2. 3: 90-1
 9. 7: 144
 9. 8. 2: 92
 9. 13. 2: 92, 146
 9. 18. 1: 94
 9. 24: 147
 9. 25. 1: 95-6, 148
 9. 10: 92
 10. 7. 1: 96
 10. 8. 2: 96
 10. 10. 1: 96, 150
 10. 16. 1: 96, 152
- R. Festus Avienus:
Carmina minora, I. 2-5: 8
Descriptio orbis terrae, 330ff.: 8
 603ff.: 8
 896: 8
Phainomena (Aratus), 1ff.: 7
- Florus:
 I. 1. 8: 87
 I. 23. 4-5: 113
 I. 23. 6: 111
 I. 24. 15: 124
 I. 33. 7: 86
 I. 33. 12: 106
 I. 39. 2: 86
 I. 39. 3: 86
 I. 39. 4: 117
 I. 39. 5: 86, 117, 118
 I. 40. 20-3: 83
 I. 40. 26: 130
 I. 41. 4-5: 76
 I. 44. 2-5: 126
 I. 46. 1: 97
 I. 46. 4-5: 76
 I. 46. 6-7: 132
 I. 46. 8: 97
 I. 46. 9: 87
 I. 46. 11: 87
 2. 19. 5-7: 86
 2. 19. 7: 74
 2. 20. 10: 135
 2. 32: 136
- Jerome (Helm):
 ann. 96: 81
 ann. 241-2: 91
 ann. 258: 144
 ann. 266: 92
 ann. 273: 93, 145
 ann. 284: 95
 ann. 301: 147
 ann. 348: 150
 ann. 363: 152
- Jordanes, *Romana*:
 210-11: 37
 212: 37
 216: 38, 79, 116
 218: 38
 221: 38
 223: 80
 224: 39
 225: 39
 233: 83
 234: 84
 235: 77
 236: 39
 237: 40
 240: 40
 291: 93
- Justinus 42. 3. 4: 131
- Livy:
 31. 1. 9-10: 111
 31. 5. 5-9: 111
 31. 9: 112
 31. 14. 9-10: 111
 37. 37. 9: 124
- Mon Ancy.* 32. 2: 137
- Obsequens 49: 81
- Orosius:
 6. 18. 23: 74
 7. 25. 9: 147
- Pausanias I. 36. 6: 112
- Periochae*:
 55: 106
 70: 81
 93: 80

Periochae:—cont.

- 95: 79
 101: 76, 83
 108: 84
 127: 85, 87
 128: 74
 130: 87
 Petr. Patr. fr. 14, *FHG* IV, 188ff.:
 148
 Pliny *HN* 4. 40: 119
 Plutarch:
 Caesar 28. 5: 107
 Camillus 29. 1-5: 109
 Crassus 18. 1-2: 132
 Polybius *Hist.*:
 2. 18. 2: 109
 16. 24. 3: 112

Scholia Gronoviana (Stangl II)
 p. 316: 121

Seneca, *ep.* 39. 1: 12

SHA

vita S. Alexandri:

13. 7: 90
 18. 55. 1: 90
 18. 56. 1: 90

vita Aureliani:

25. 1: 146
 25. 2: 93
 32. 4-33. 4: 146
 34. 3: 93

vita Caracallae:

6. 6: 89
 9. 12: 89

SHA—cont.

vita Cari:

8. 1: 40
 8. 2: 93
 9. 1: 93

vita Gallieni:

10. 1: 92
 10. 6: 92

vita Gordiani Tertii:

28. 1: 91, 143
 30. 8: 91
 34. 2: 91

vita Hadriani:

5. 3: 140
 24. 2: 140

vita Macrini:

4. 7: 89
 5. 2: 89

vita Tyranii Triginta:

15. 1-2: 92
 15. 4: 92

vita Valeriani:

4. 2: 92

Strabo:

5. 3: 109
 7. 6. 1: 119

Suetonius:

De Grammaticis 10: 12

Vesp. 8: 120

Zosimos:

1. 36. 2: 144
 1. 39. 1-2: 145

(b) NON-LITERARY

CIL

- III, 307, 13643, 14184²⁰⁻²¹—
 14184³¹, 14184³⁹: 159
 V, 1838: 115
 VI, 537 = ILS I 2944: 7

CREBM

- I, 650-5: 128
 III, 511, 524, 1014, 1020: 138

III, 588-9, 613-15, 1043-4: 139

III, 603-6: 139

III, 474-6, 877, 919, 959, 977-81,
 997, 1009-11, 1077a: 140

III, 1033-40: 140

IV, p. 437ff., 440ff.: 141

V, 89-90, 197-200: 142

V, p. 175ff.: 142

V, 79, 86, 107-9, 118-21, 131-3,
 157-8, 326, 555-7, 563: 141

CTh

- 2. 19. 2: 162
- 3. 14. 1: 2n
- 7. 4. 30=Cod Iust 12. 37. 13: 158
- 8. 4. 11=Cod Iust 11. 57. 3: 6
- 9. 19. 3: 8
- 10. 19. 7: 162
- 12. 1. 34: 157
- 13. 10. 2: 160
- 13. 11. 2=Cod Iust 11. 48. 10: 159
- 14. 1. 1: 10
- 14. 9. 1: 10
- 14. 9. 2: 10

B. Filow, *Klio* 12 (1912), 234ff.: 162

IG 635: 8

P. Lacau, *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 34 (1934), 29: 156

J. Maurice, *Numismatique Constantiniennne* I, 484-5: 149

Not. Dign., *Or.* (ed. Seeck) p. 44: 6

RA 6 (1935), 142: 122

RIC I

46-8, p. 63: 136

98-100, p. 70: 136

256, p. 84: 136

302-4, p. 86: 136

305-10, p. 86/7: 136

311-13, p. 87: 136

A. Schulten, *JÖAI* 9 (1906), 61ff.: 5

INDEX OF MANUSCRIPTS

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Bamberg E. III 22: 3n, 4, 6, 9, 13,
23, 25</p> <p>Brussels 4659: 3, 4, 13, 26</p> <p>Escorial R. II. 18: 3, 4, 13, 21-3</p> <p>Gotha 101: 4, 13, 14, 23-4</p> <p>Paris nouv. acq. lat.
310: 3, 4, 14, 22-3
6114: 3, 4, 13, 22-3
6113a: 3n, 4, 13, 24-5
5822: 3n, 24-5</p> <p>Petropolitanus, codex of Eutropius'
<i>Breviarium</i>: 13</p> | <p>recentiores (<i>Festus</i>, <i>Brev.</i>): 26-31</p> <p>Sangallensis 878 (<i>Origo Gentis Ro-
manorum</i>): 19</p> <p>Vaticanus 1860: 13</p> <p>Vaticanus Palatinus 927: 13</p> <p>Vienna
89: 3, 4, 13, 22-3
323: 3, 4, 13, 22-3
451: 3n, 24-5</p> <p>Vindobonnensis 3416 (<i>Origo Gentis
Romanorum</i>): 19</p> |
|---|--|